FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 027 10 February 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gorbachev Favors Lawyers' Appeal on Disarmament AA 1
Chernyshev on U.S. Nuclear 'Big Stick' AA 2
CSCE Delegations Examine Proposals, Progress AA 3
  Kovalev on 'Viability' [PRAVDA 1 Feb] AA 4
  Ornatskiy Backs Economic Forum AA 6
  Kashlev: Few Western Offers AA 6
  GDR, USSR Submit Proposal AA 7
  Taranikov: Reductions Overdue AA 7
Arbatov on 'Realistic' Policy Initiatives [Budapest NEPSZAVA 12 Jan] AA 8

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' [Pastyuk, Bogdanov, Filativ, Kurilin, Agayants, Pravdin] CC 1
Ovchinnikov in PRAVDA on U.S. 'Neoglobalism' [4 Feb] CC 5
Kolesnichenko on U.S. Policy, Allied Reaction [PRAVDA 8 Feb] CC 7
Gorbachev To Speak at Nuclear Forum 16 Feb [TANJUG] CC 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Washington News Conference Reviews CPSU Plenum A 1
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on NEWSWEEK 'Glasnost' Feature [18 Jan] A 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views State of the Union Message [Ponomarev 1 Feb] A 4
Belyayev on U.S. Sovietologists' 'Chimeras' [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 4 Feb] A 8

EASTERN EUROPE

Moscow Weekly Interviews Poland's Cardinal Glemp [Pochivalov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 4 Feb] F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

FRG Parties' Views on East-West Ties Assessed [Kondratyev] G 1
IZVESTIYA Links Thule Radar Modernization to SDI [Sychev, 5 Feb] G 2
  Official Protest [AFP] G 3
IZVESTIYA Reveals French 'Spy Satellite' Program [Kovalenko, 5 Feb] G 3
U.S., UK Blamed for Tension in Mediterranean [Vasilyev] G 4
LE FIGARO Support for U.S. Pacific Role Censured [Kovalenko in IZVESTIYA 4 Feb] G 5
UK Defense Ministry Movie Branded 'Anti-Soviet' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Feb] G 6
Austrian Film on Prisoners 'Anti-Soviet Lampoon' [Novikov in IZVESTIYA 9 Feb] G 6
CPSU Greets Luxembourg CP Leader, Bestows Order G 7
  Birthday Greetings [PRAVDA 7 Feb] G 7
  October Revolution Order [PRAVDA 7 Feb] G 7
Turkey's Islamic Fundamentalism, Danger to Unity [Starasov] G 7
Briefs: Danish Agro-Industrial Seminar; Outgoing Belgian Ambassador G 8

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Reportage on Komplektov's Latin American Tour K 1
  Sees Brazil's Foreign Minster [IZVESTIYA 5 Feb] K 1
  Meets Uruguayan President [IZVESTIYA 8 Feb] K 1
  Foreign Ministry Consultations [IZVESTIYA 9 Feb] K 1
  Future Gorbachev Visit [Havana] K 2
  Additional Coverage [cross-reference] K 2
EEC, C. America States Consider Regional Crisis [Trushin] K 2
TASS Interviews Haitian CP Leader on Protests [Pshenichnikov] K 3

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Council of Ministers Presidium Meets 9 February R 1
Prokhorov Discusses Reforming Electoral System R 1
Medvedev Assesses Gorbachev's Reform Initiatives [Rome AVANTI! 25-26 Jan (AVANTI! DELLA DOMENICA Supplement)] R 2
Ambartsumov on Democratization, Human Rights [MOSCOW NEWS English 8 Feb] R 5
Academician Views Restructuring, Sociology [Zaslavskaya in PRAVDA 6 Feb] R 7
More on Phone-in Conference on Railroads R 12
Decree on 'Liberation' of Dissidents Confirmed [AFP] R 14
Mortality Rate Falls Due to Anti-Alcohol Program R 15
Damage, Casualties Reported in Georgian Floods [IZVESTIYA 6 Feb] R 15

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Economist Explains Draft Law on Enterprises S 1
    Interviewed on Acceleration S 2
        [Korotkov in Bratislava PRAVDA 27 Jan]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Kazakh CPCC Food Supply Panel Meets T 1
        [KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jan]
Kolbin Chairs Meeting on Food Supplies T 3
CSA Reports on Equipment Preparation for Spring T 3

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Continued Coverage of Soyuz TM-2 Flight U 1
    Official Interviewed U 1
    Cosmonauts Test Equipment U 2
    Docking Preparations U 2
    Docking Scheduled 7 Feb U 2
    Soyuz TM-2 Docks U 3
Scientists To Test Soil From Mars by Year 2000 U 3

GORBACHEV FAVORS LAWYERS' APPEAL ON DISARMAMENT

LD051239 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Brussels, February 5 TASS -- The secretariat of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers has announced today that it received from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, a reply to the association's address with the appeal to continue the dialogue started in Geneva and Reykjavik to put an end to the arms race.

It is noted in the communique of the association that its president Joe Norman received from Mikhail Gorbachev a reply, in which he said that he had read with much interest the address to him." The Soviet leader, the association says in the communique, which summarizes Mikhail Gorbachev's reply, pointed out that he shared the worry voiced in the association's address over the continuation of the arms race and the risks of the militarization of space.

The Soviet leadership, the association goes on to say in its summary of the reply from the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has a favourable view of the association's appeal for the continuation of the dialogue started in Geneva and Reykjavik to eliminate nuclear weapons in the world and to establish an all-embracing system of security for all the states and peoples. The Soviet Union is convinced that such an historical chance must not be missed. The radical reduction and eventual total abolition of nuclear weapons with strict respect for legal guarantees and renunciation of the militarization of space could pave the way to change and substantial improvements in the international situation and create an atmosphere of trust which would make it possible to resolve social and economic problems facing the world today.

Everything today depends on the U.S., the leaders of which should display a political will correctly to evaluate the current world situation and stop seeking what cannot be achieved, military superiority over the USSR. The Soviet Union has already taken stops and will take fresh ones to the best of its ability to safeguard peace and avert the threat of nuclear war looming over the world.

We think the association quotes Mikhail Gorbachev as saying, that the participation of ever broader sections of the world population in this struggle is bringing closer the point at which mankind will enter a non-nuclear age. Our country thinks highly of the efforts of democratic lawyers for peace and progress and their contribution towards the strengthening of the fundamental principles of international law and in defense of social equality and democracy. The association's efforts in that direction will continue to enjoy the Soviet Union's support. The USSR reaffirms that it will keep honouring the U.N. Charter, international treaties and agreements and its own obligations. We stand for the further consolidation of the legal base of state-to-state relations. That is why we recently submitted for the consideration of the United Nations a draft memorandum on international law.

The association also says that it has not got any reply to an identical address sent to U.S. President Ronald Reagan simultaneously with the one to Mikhail Gorbachev.

CHERNYSHEV ON U.S. NUCLEAR 'BIG STICK'

LD060731 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 5 Feb (TASS) -- TASS Observer on military matters Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

Speaking at hearings in the allocations committee of the U.S. Congress's House of Representatives, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger called the SDI program the keystone of the administration's policy. The "keystone" is one of the main reasons for Washington's reluctance to join the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. The nuclear explosion conducted on the Nevada test site the other day has provided yet another vivid proof of the haste with which the present U.S. Administration is putting the SDI program onto a practical footing.

SDI, with its nuclear test program is aimed at achieving military-strategic superiority for the United States and satisfying its ambitious designs for holding it over the world like the threat of a nuclear 'big stick' in space. It was not without reason that the U.S. Assistant Energy Secretary S. Foley said on one occasion that the testing and production of nuclear weapons will continue into the 21st century.

All the world knows that, as part of the SDI program, a nuclear-triggered x-ray laser is being developed. This the adherents of "Star WArs" call 'the longest stick', capable of controlling [kontrolirovat] space and ensuring domination on earth. But x-ray lasers are by no means all there is to the nuclear content of "Star Wars". Under that program, a whole spectrum of third-generation nuclear devices is being developed for use as strike weapons in space.

In February 1985 the U.S. Secretary of Defense and the U.S. Energy Secretary signed a special document stating their departments must conduct vigorous work on the development of such devices for "Star Wars".

The nuclear explosions in Nevada are necessary not for monitoring [kontrol] the combat efficiency of existing nuclear arsenals, as they are trying to make out in Washington, but for trying out [otrabotka] increasingly new, and ever more lethal, nuclear armaments. In so doing, as the U.S. specialists themselves admit, with the nuclear devices becoming more complicated, more and more tests are required.

One can also not rule out that, in their striving to acquire "a big stick in space" as quickly as possible, the U.S. "space warriors" may also use "classic" nuclear weapons as space armaments. Let us recall, how in June 1985 the not unknown E. Teller, speaking in Paris in the role of commercial traveller for "Star Wars", stated that upon their entry into the atmosphere missile warheads can best be destroyed with a nuclear explosion. All this is being said and done for SDI, which is being advertised by the U.S. President as a "denuclearized" [bezyadernyy] program!

It would be useful to remind the SDI champions of the statement made by George Kistyakovsky, the well-known U.S. scientist who was in Alamogordo when for the first time in the history of mankind a lethal mushroom cloud burst into the sky. Many years have elapsed since then, he said, but until now we are wandering in this desert, and it is precisely the United States which is continually taking the first step along the mortally dangerous road of a spiralling arms race going further upward.

It is taking this step now as well, by rearming America and creating "space weapons".

Is it not time to abandon the striving to continue keeping mankind on this mortally dangerous path, for in the nuclear space age the whole of our planet can be turned into a lifeless desert. Today's underground explosions in Nevada state carry a threat to earth from the heights of space!

CSCE DELEGATIONS EXAMINE PROPOSALS, PROGRESS

LD031907 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna, 3 Feb (TASS) -- The Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has entered a new stage of its work. Examination of the proposals by the delegations on all aspects of the European process has started.

Poland's proposal that the next stage of the Stockholm Conference should discuss in parallel measures for strengthening trust and practical matters of the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, is being energetically debated.

The USSR delegation set out the approach of the Soviet Union in principle to the whole range of these issues at a plenary session today. Concerning the content of future talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, Yu. B. Kashlev, the head of the Soviet delegation said the joint position of the socialist countries is precisely set out in the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact member-states, adopted at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee in June 1986. It presents a balanced program worked out in detail for European disarmament in a broad geographical zone -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. It also proposes a schedule for reductions under which the level of military confrontation in Europe would be reduced, the danger of sudden attack would be decreased and military-strategic stability would be strengthened.

It is proposed that the reduction be implemented under reliable and effective monitoring [kontrol] using both national technical means and international verification [proverka] procedures including on-site inspection.

The head of the USSR delegation also set out a number of principled provisions concerning the forms and frameworks of future talks.

The problem of reducing armed forces and conventional weapons on the scale of the whole of Europe should be discussed on an all-European basis with the participation of all 35 participant states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Such an approach presupposes that neutral and nonaligned states should participate in the talks in an acceptable form. It would be extremely unwise not to make use of their political potential and experience when one recalls the positive role they played at the first stage of the Stockholm Conference. It would be possible to make use during the second stage of the flexible mechanism for conducting the talks which arose earlier.

The Soviet delegation proceeds from the premise that the mandate for the future talks should be determined by the Vienna meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The USSR intends to raise, at the next stage of the Stockholm Conference, the question of notification of major independent exercises of the airforces and navies, limiting the scale of military exercises, and the issue of notifications, which should include the territories of all the participant states.

The head of the Soviet delegation stressed that at the talks on disarmament in Europe, the subject of discussion should be real reductions in armed forces and conventional weapons, and not concepts of "imbalance" and "asymmetry" imposed by certain NATO countries. Debate about this obviously invented subject can only prolong the transition to serious negotiations for many years and sink the very idea of European disarmament.

The Soviet spokesman noted that the USSR's principled stance does not rule out the possibility that, to speed the transition to a thorough consideration of questions of disarmament in Europe, any forms of work might be used, including unofficial contacts, both bilateral, and in a broader circle.

In conclusion, the head of the Soviet delegation stated the European process has, at its disposal, sufficient possibilities to add to the pace of resolution of the vitally important problem of reducing the level of armed confrontation in Europe.

Kovalev on 'Viability'

PM031145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "The Vienna Meeting: A Crucial Phase"]

[Text] Yesterday the plenary session of the Vienna meeting of representatives of CSCE participant states was addressed by A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs. The general discussion at the Vienna meeting, he said, is drawing to a close in accordance with the meeting's schedule and agenda. Work concerning the submission and examination of states' proposals, which was begun before the recess, is moving to the forefront. A number of states, including the Soviet Union, have already submitted a number of their proposals. Others, it appears, are about to do so; it is to be hoped they will do so fairly soon. Thus, we are about to embark on an especially crucial phase of work -- the preparation of tangible accords -- for the purpose of which the present all-European meeting was convened, after all.

Here at the negotiating table we all understand perfectly and are constantly aware our meeting is not taking place in a political vacuum. On the contrary, the events on the European continent, which we share as our home, and the events taking place beyond its confines have a profound effect on the atmosphere of the meeting of 33 of the continent's states and the United States and Canada. The multifaceted and multilayered international and domestic events affect, in one way or another, the course, rhythm, tenor, and productivity of the meeting's work.

The entire experience of the all-European process which began in Helsinki more than 10 years ago enables us to draw at least two conclusions.

First, this process has proved its viability, and I would even say resilience. Despite its vicissitudes and serious setbacks caused by the policy of confrontation and arms race, including attempts to extend the arms race to space, the all-European process continues to serve the aims of detente, cooperation, and security in Europe and throughout the world.

Second, the all-European process, the Helsinki Final Act, and forums such as the Stockholm conference teach us the difficult art of learning to better understand each other, to take into account, and what is more, seriously take into account, the national interests of others, and to find common political denominators acceptable to all its participants. To achieve this it is especially important to know each other better, to regard partners not necessarily as adversaries, to view them without preconceived ideas and age-old prejudices. This is the approach adopted by the Soviet Union in respect of the Vienna meeting participant states. We would like to be able to count on reciprocity toward our country in this respect.

The international situation and the domestic life of most countries, the Soviet representative continued, is full of events which determine, frequently for the long-term, the policy of states, their mutual relations, and their stances on international problems of paramount significance for peoples and the whole of mankind.

In our time the organic link between states' foreign and domestic policy and their increasing interdependence in this fragile world fraught with terrible dangers is felt particularly keenly. Mutual respect for and well-intentioned consideration of the concerns, interests, and hopes of individual states are an indispensable precondition for the successful cooperation, the co-creativity so to speak, of our states and peoples aimed at ensuring the survival of the human race and firmly establishing the new political thinking.

The path toward accords capable of bringing states with different social systems closer together and vindicating the considerable hopes which people are pinning to the Vienna meeting lies only through better mutual understanding.

A.G. Kovalev then detailed the recent CPSU Central Committee Plenum held in Moscow, describing it as an event which, even according to the strictest standards, is of crucial importance for the present and the future of the Soviet people.

Proceeding from the fundamental values of our domestic and foreign policy, which coincide with the supreme human values, the Soviet Union will continue to struggle for a world free from nuclear weapons. The concept of such a world and ways of achieving it were formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement. The Soviet Union will continue to seek the solution of disarmament problems proceeding from the high ground achieved in Reykjavik.

Returning to the question of the cooperation, the co-creativity, of all states taking part in the all-European process, I would like to highlight the following thought: Such cooperation, such co-creativity is possible only on the basis of equality, regardless of whether the state is large, medium, or small. It is also achievable here at the Vienna meeting given general awareness of the need to achieve mutually acceptable accords on all the main baskets of questions outlined in the Helsinki Final Act -- political, external economic, and humanitarian questions. We propose to resolve political problems only by political means and humanitarian problems in a humane manner.

We hope the Vienna meeting, whose success the Soviet Union intends to actively promote, will become a good example of the productivity of the new thinking in the affairs of Europe and the entire world community, the speaker stressed.

Ornatskiy Backs Economic Forum

LD061408 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna February 6 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Tyupayev.

A member of the Soviet delegation today addressed the plenary session of the Vienna follow-up meeting on security and cooperation in Europe.

Igor Ornatskiy backed the proposal advanced by the delegations from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and the German Democratic Republic for holding an "economic forum" in Prague.

At this forum, the participating countries could examine in an all-round way such problems of the all-European economic process as scientific and technological cooperation, specialization and co-production, and joint ventures.

The Soviet representative informed the session's participants about major provisions of the decree by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers on the establishment on Soviet territory and the activity of joint enterprises, international associations and organizations with the participation of Soviet and foreign organizations, firms and management bodies.

He emphasized that use of these promising forms would impart dynamism to the Soviet Union's foreign economic ties and would promote mutually beneficial economic cooperation in Europe.

Kashlev: Few Western Offers

LD051810 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Excerpts] The Vienna meeting of representatives of states participating in the CSCE is continuing its work. Comrade Kashlev, leader of the Soviet delegation and special envoy, told our correspondent about the course of the meeting:

[Begin Kashlev recording] Unfortunately, the picture emerging at the moment is somewhat lacking in synonymity. So far the most important proposals on all directions of the Helsinki process have been contributed by the socialist countries. [passage omitted listing proposals] However, to date the NATO countries have not contributed a single proposal. This is putting us very much on our guard because when the Vienna meeting was opening at the ministerial level, many, including Western ministers, said they were interested in the development of the all-European process and were in favor of its balanced movement forward along all of the most important directions; that is, military and political, trade and economic, and humanitarian. So much time has passed, and they have made no proposals.

Meanwhile, they are carrying out a selective study, so-to-speak, selection of those proposals which have already been put forward, mainly by socialist countries. They are concentrating their attention on those questions which they consider to be advantageous to themselves, completely forgetting their own calls for a balanced approach. So, for the duration of the first stage and a week already of the second stage, they have been trying to artificially (?hang) all the subject-matter of the all-European (?nature of our) meeting on issues of human rights [words indistinct] and even more accurately, on questions of departures from and entries into countries. Of course, the problem of family contacts and departures concerns [words indistinct] category of people and perhaps at least 1,000 people, (?but there are) questions of security, and in the name of our all-European process it is directly stated that it is a conference on security and cooperation. [passage omitted on importance of question of security] [end recording]

GDR, USSR Submit Proposal

LD061613 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1256 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna, 6 Feb (ADN) -- The GDR and the USSR submitted a joint proposal on the further development of cooperation in the sphere of science and technology at the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting today. It envisages the member-states working for the extension of this cooperation on the basis of mutual advantage in the new and particularly dynamically developing spheres of science and technology. At the same time, all steps which counter the development and expansion of scientific-technological relations and the transfer of commercial technology should cease.

The head of the GDR delegation, Ambassador Peter Steglich, stressed that it is an important task of the Vienna follow-up conference to improve the political conditions for economic enterprises and research facilities which are involved in technology cooperation. The exchange of high technology products and engineering achievements in particular should be intensified.

The further development of scientific-technical cooperation between the CSCE member-states could lead to positive effects on international economic relations. The Vienna CSCE meeting is a suitable venue for providing such constructive starting points for forward-looking steps.

Taranikov: Reductions Overdue

LD100925 Moscow TASS in English 0840 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna February 10 TASS -- Reductions in the armed forces and armaments in Europe are an urgent and long-overdue need, Major General Viktor Taranikov, a member of the Soviet delegation for the meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, said in an interview to TASS correspondent Anatoliy Tyupayev. The proposal made by the Warsaw Treaty countries at the Vienna meeting for reducing the armed forces of the two sides in Europe by one million men is very substantial and its implementation could make it possible to achieve a considerable relaxation in Europe.

The major general continued that, although there was no imbalance in the conventional forces between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty organisation, the West continued deliberately to misrepresent the picture. [paragraph continues]

Making comparisons, the West does not count mobilisation and human resources, reserve forces and stockpiled armaments and technology of NATO, excludes from the count the French and Spanish forces and the forces under national commands, inflates figures for the Warsaw Treaty organisation and deflates those for its own forces.

But if we evaluate the balance of forces objectively rather than for propaganda purposes, there is rough parity between the two groupings in Europe. This explains the position of the Warsaw Treaty countries. This explains the position of the Warsaw Treaty countries at the talks: They are seeking reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments in all Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, in accordance with the proposal made in the Budapest address of the Warsaw Treaty member countries, the Soviet delegate said.

He expressed the conviction that since the problem of reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments concerned all the European countries without exception, it should be considered on an all-European basis with the participation of all the 35 CSCE states. The lawful interests of neutral and non-aligned states must not be ignored either.

The Soviet delegate also believes that the next round of the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament is the right forum to discuss reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments.

The proposal of the Polish delegation for extending the mandate of the conference envisions talks on disarmament measures in parallel with proposals for confidence-and security-building measures which were made at the first round of the Stockholm Conference or will be made in the future. This proposal, supported by the other Warsaw Treaty countries, is on the negotiating table of the Vienna meeting. It can ensure broad progress in every area, including confidence-and security-building efforts and disarmament, Major General Viktor Tatarnikov said.

ARBATOV ON 'REALISTIC' POLICY INITIATIVES

AU161151 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 12 Jan 87 p 3

[Interview with Academician Georgiy Arbatov, head of the Soviet Union's United States of America and Canada Institute, by NOVOSTI: "Realistic Foreign Policy Initiatives" -- date and place not given; first two paragraphs are newspaper's introduction]

[Text] The year 1986, which the United Nations declared as the Year of Peace, is already history. This was the period of the large-scale realistic foreign policy initiatives made by the Soviet Union, initiatives aimed at eliminating the weapons of mass destruction, radically reducing conventional arms, and eliminating sources of international tension. From this point of view, the Soviet-initiated summit meeting in Reykjavik was a considerable event.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov answered some relevant questions asked by NOVOSTI.

[NOVOSTI] What is the importance of the Reykjavik summit and how can it affect the further development of East-West and Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Arbatov] In my opinion, the main achievement of the Reykjavik summit is that, for the first time in a very long period, we succeeded in ridding the issue of disarmament and nuclear arms reduction of the bureaucratic cobweb with which the enemies of detente surrounded it in the course of the negotiations prior to the summit meeting. According to Gorbachev, the negotiating table was covered by all kinds of "naphthalene-smelling junk". The Vienna talks, which have been going on for 13 years, provide the most obvious example of this. It is enough for me to mention that a total of 0.5 percent of the armed forces stationed in central Europe has been the issue discussed in all the versions of the agreement negotiated for the last 13 years. The pace of the Vienna talks and of other talks proved that, on the one hand, the West could not reject dialogue with the Soviet Union while, on the other hand, the West did not want or was not ready to take determined steps for the creation of disarmament and of mutually acceptable conditions. More than that, the negotiations gradually became useless and even harmful; and they also became the factors of retreat in the thinking of the Western public opinion. With these negotiations, those in power in the West were proving their sham activity and thus reassuring people, while they were doing nothing concrete.

This "napthalene-smelling junk" was swept away from the table in Reykjavik. The issues immediately became clearer and more tangible. The issues were freed from the cobweb of words. It became clear that it was impossible to sweep the precisely outlined and concrete proposals made by the Soviet Union under the carpet and they were waiting for active solutions.

Therefore, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are doing everything in their power to make sure we do not return to the "pre-Reykjavik" phase and the negotiations will continue at the point at which they concluded in Reykjavik. That is what we expect of the U.S. side too.

[NOVOSTI] In your opinion, why was there no agreement achieved in Reykjavik on the issue of the radical reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons?

[Arbatov] At the summit the Soviet Union initially proposed both sides reduce their strategic weapons by 50 percent in 5 years, eliminate the intermediate-range missiles stationed in Europe, and come to an agreement with the U.S. by which the Soviet Union would maintain 100 nuclear warheads on its intermediate-range missiles stationed in Asia and the United States would maintain a similar number of nuclear warheads on its similar-type missiles stationed on its territory. We proposed to strengthen our agreement on the missile defense system and begin negotiations on the complete ban to nuclear tests. In the course of the negotiations, however, the possibility of an even more radical solution emerged, namely, the complete elimination of nuclear arms by 1996. All these, however, came to nothing when we began talking about the strengthening of the agreements on the missile defense systems and on SDI. The main obstacle on the road leading to a world free of nuclear weapons was the stubborn U.S. desire to give itself a free hand on issues concerning SDI, something the elite of the U.S. military industry considers as some sort of panacea.

I was present at the Reykjavik summit and saw the U.S. President would have gladly come to an agreement. He seemed sad not to have succeeded in achieving results. This was because Reagan, particularly more recently, has been making great efforts to make sure that history will regard him as a President who brought peace. He has every reason to be worried: The U.S. media is criticizing the President with increasing frequency for being the only U.S. President for more than 50 years not to have signed an agreement with the Soviet Union. Was he prepared to give something for the Reykjavik agreement, something that is essential for agreement? [paragraph continues]

Was he prepared to pay by going half way to mutually acceptable decisions, rather than making some unilateral concessions? Hardly. Reagan failed this test. Perhaps he would have liked some nice agreement but, at the same time, he did not want to give up his plans, among others, SDI. I think Reagan is not particularly versed in arms limitations or military policy. Therefore, his effort to appear as a peace-fighter is perhaps nothing more than a naive dream.

As for the President's entourage, many of them did not want any kind of agreement. One could feel this at the time of the Reykjavik summit. It was no accident that Gorbachev said at the press conference that Reagan was unable to rid himself of the military-industrial complex surrounding him and his administration.

The military-industrial complex is, of course, a great power but it is nevertheless not omnipotent. Therefore, I believe the fact no agreement was reached in Iceland does not mean such an agreement is inconceivable. Therefore, every peace-loving force on our planet should struggle for an agreement.

[NOVOSTI] What is the contribution of the outstanding public personalities and scientists of the Soviet Union and other countries to the struggle for peace?

[Artabov] There has been a considerable increase in the activity of antiwar forces both in the Soviet Union and abroad recently. Scientists are playing a particular role in this struggle. Thus, for example, the appeal of the movement called "International Physicians for Preventing Nuclear War" to avoid the nuclear nightmare is of great importance. If a third world war broke out, there would be no doctors to attend the injured. The model of "nuclear winter" worked out by scientists proves the extent of the fatal consequences of a worldwide nuclear conflict on every living creature on our planet.

Many scientists in various countries are exposing the lie connected with the SDI and are drawing attention to the destructive danger of uncontrolled nuclear energy. This is particularly important since the ignorance of the masses is the main weapon in the hands of the militarists. War against people can be prepared only in secret. Thus, scientists who reveal the reality are making a considerable contribution to the avoiding of a nuclear war. Public opinion still has a lot to do. I believe that we can avoid a nuclear catastrophe only by joint efforts.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD062311 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Feb 87

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Konstantin Pastyuk, All-Union Radio commentator, with Professor Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute; Colonel V.I. Filatov, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent; Aleksandr Kurilin, Bonn correspondent for All-Union Radio; Nikolay Agayants, All-Union Radio Foreign political commentator; and Sergey Pravdin, All-Union Radio Commentator]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] At the moment, the editorial office here is getting a lot of letters, the writers of which fully approve our country's foreign policy and its tireless efforts to normalize relations with the United States. At the same time, they condemn the Reagan administration's unrealistic foreign policy course, its reluctance to normalize these relations, and the United States' continuation of underground nuclear blasts. [passage omitted]

Comrade Mamedov from Ashkhabad expresses the hope that the U.S. Administration will yet heed the voice of reason and change its foreign policy. Judging from the last nuclear blast conducted recently at the Nevada test site, however, this has obviously not yet happened.

The state of Soviet-U.S. relations and how they are going to take shape -- and the world situation depends on that to a considerable extent -- all this greatly interests the whole world today. It also interests Soviet people, which is demonstrated by the letters which continue to come to the editorial office. Taking part in our program today is Professor and Doctor of Historical Sciences Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute. Please.

[Bogdanov] If we are to analyze in brief the conduct of the U.S. side after Reykjavik, on the one hand the Reagan administration has made massive efforts to distort the essence of the Soviet position at Reykjavik and to disown its own agreement to eliminate all kinds of nuclear weapons, to ascribe stubbornness and unconstructive behavior to the Soviet Union. The main argument of the administration has been devil-may-care statements indicating, they say, the main aim of the Russians is to bury President Reagan's SDI, which he defended, even at the cost of rejecting a nuclear-free world. On the other hand, having breached the limits of the SALT II treaty, having effectively demolished it by bringing into operation the 131st B-52 bomber, the U.S. side has clearly demonstrated it continues to be guided in Soviet-U.S. relations by the principle of hegemonism and by the position of strength.

Well, of course, one serious test of the U.S. administration's intentions was its attitude to the moratorium on nuclear blasts, introduced by the Soviet Union on 6 August 1985. For 18 months, a deathly silence has reigned over the test sites of the Soviet Union, but the U.S. side has in this time conducted 25 nuclear blasts of various capacity, including the latest on 3 February. With each blast, the U.S. administration seems to be repeating no and no to the possibility of stopping the arms race and to the possibility of creating a nuclear-free world. Indeed, the nuclear tests are needed by those who are building a new generation of mass destruction weapons and by those who intend to use atomic energy to equip combat lasers, which are the basis of SDI, and are designed to deprive the Soviet side of the possibility of making a retaliatory strike [udar vozmezdiya] in the event of a U.S. nuclear attack.

It is not so much a matter of the power of the explosive devices being tested in Nevada as the political aspect of the affair; Is the world to be without nuclear weapons or not?

Alongside this, the United States has not ceased its attempts to revise and, ultimately, to wreck the fundamental ABM Treaty of 1972. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES report of 4 February this year, the Reagan administration intends to continue to adhere to the so-called broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty, which in fact means testing SDI components in space, which would be a most flagrant violation of the treaty, which permits research only under laboratory conditions. Essentially, it is a question of the Washington grave-diggers having embarked upon burying this most important Soviet-U.S. treaty too, which has for many years ensured strategic stability.

[Patysuk] Radomir Georgiyevich, how is our country reacting to the U.S. action?

[Bogdanov] Bearing in mind these realities, nevertheless, Soviet policy has been and remains to be consolidating the positive results of Reykjavik. Indeed, there were major ones: a 50 percent reduction over 5 years in all three elements of the strategic triad and the liquidation of intermediate range nuclear weapons in Europe with, of course, the corresponding accords on the nondeployment in space of strike weapons.

From the moment Soviet-U.S. talks were resumed in Geneva, where the Reykjavik package was on the table, the Soviet side, wishing to bring the talks out of the deadlock in which they previously found themselves, proposed renouncing endless general discussions and moving on to reaching detailed agreement on the provisions of a framework accord encompassing all aspects of the talks: strengthening the status [rezhim] of the ABM Treaty, reducing strategic offensive weapons right up to their elimination by the end of 1996, eliminating U.S. and Soviet intermediate range missiles in Europe, and settling the matter of the start of talks on completely banning nuclear tests. Of course, these agreements must be implemented as a whole, in association with each other. The Soviet delegation's constructive line has led to progress on a number of aspects of reaching agreement on wording that consolidates the results of Reykjavik. However, cautionary aspects have also arisen in all areas of the talks. So, what is the Soviet side and how does it intend to act in these conditions? Our course is formulated in the Soviet program for eliminating nuclear weapons of 15 January last year, in our platform advanced by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Reykjavik. All of this is still valid. Also valid are our firm intentions to continue to do everything necessary to realize the Reykjavik solutions. It is just up to the U.S. side.

[Patsyuk] The last question for you: Comrade Kurilko from Pavlograd in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast asks if there will be a meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

[Bogdanov] If, in this context, one examines the question of the possibility of a summit meeting between the Soviet leader and the U.S. President -- and in certain circumstances such a meeting would make a serious contribution to strengthening peace and security -- then it is obviously logical to proceed from the following: Given significant accords at the Geneva talks, worthy of being made fast by the top political leaders of the two countries, it could be a reality.

[Pastyuk] Comrades Abrashev, Sedykh, and Chestnykh from the town of Chaplygin, Lipetsk Oblast, are interested in the current situation in Afghanistan and the losses that the Soviet internationalist servicemen are sustaining there. Has this changed at all following the unilateral cease-fire announced by the Afghan Government? We have invited to our microphone today Colonel Viktor Ivanovich Filatov, special correspondent of the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, who has recently returned from a trip to Afghanistan. Please, Viktor Ivanovich.

[Filatov] These days, Afghanistan is living under the conditions of the truce proclaimed by the government of the Republic. The most energetic steps are being taken to normalize the situation in the republic by political means and by seeking out ways to national accord. Of course, the truce is not war, but neither is it full peace. The will for peace is also needed on the part of the side to which it is being offered. So, it is as yet a bit early to sum up final results. But, the question from listener Abrashev and his comrades from the town of Chaplygin about how many Soviet servicemen have been killed or wounded in Afghanistan needs precisely that kind of result.

But now, before going on to talk about Afghanistan, I would like to preface it with this: The voices of the West are now maliciously manipulating the statistics about losses in Afghanistan with all their might, and they are not counting in tens or even hundreds, but in thousands, and tens of thousands. We also read in the newspapers about daily losses in the famous war in the Near East. There too -- if one can believe it -- losses are expressed in gigantic figures: 10,000, 30,000, 50,000 killed and wounded. But let us not hurry to inscribe the names of these tens of thousands on the memorial roll. As the ancients said, at no time do people lie as they do in war. In this connection, I recall an anecdote about Suvrorov, that supposedly after he had taken Ismail, the chief of staff sat down to compose a report for the mother empress. He compiled it and showed Suvorov, who read it and said: But, old chap, it says here that in taking the fortress my men shot 5,000 Turks, why spare (?busurman), add another zero.

Of course, this is a joke, an anecdote, but what military leader in what army did not want to triumph over the largest possible enemy? Well, to be serious, let us ask, what does it mean to know the precise, true number of losses sustained by your enemy? First, knowing exactly if you have chosen the right tactics in combat; second, knowing if you are training your soldiers and officers correctly; third, knowing about the weapons and combat equipment being supplied to your soldiers. You can find out quite a lot of great importance about yourself and your enemy, knowing precise figures for losses sustained by whomever you are fighting. In all wars, all intelligence officers have given much to know precise enemy losses. If you are to take into account the fact that for the United States, Afghanistan has become a testing ground where they are working out tactics for combat operations under the conditions of mountains and resistance — which are there — working out new weapons and combat equipment, you can understand just how they would like to get the precise results of their experiments by our own hand, from our own newspapers and our own radio. Then, they could make major adjustments to their piratical business in Afghanistan. So, we are not going to be making life more difficult for our boys in Afghanistan by our own hand. Let the voices amuse themselves with astronomical figures; after all, that is also a way of getting secrets out of us. No, we are not going to fire upon our own.

[Patsyuk] These same listeners -- I will again vie their names, Abrashev, Sedykh, and Chestnykh -- go on to ask: Why did we go into Afghanistan?

[Filatov] To be honest, I must admit this question is somewhat unexpected. I have often visited units and subdivisions of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, met rank and file soldiers and their commanders. I spent many days with them in the areas where they were performing combat operations. My weapon was not an automatic rifle, but a pen. I wrote down everything our soldiers over there said. Of course, there was a multitude of the most diverse questions, but no one at any time in Afghanistan, neither our people nor Afghans, asked me why we went into Afghanistan. No one over there has any question about that. There, they know why, because it is right in front of them.

Yet, I will try to answer this question. To be precise, we did not go in there, we were called in. It is a historical fact that we were repeatedly and urgently asked by three successive Afghan Governments for help in defending the country against incursions from outside by the forces of counterrevolution. It is a fact of history that all three Afghan Governments repeatedly and urgently asked for help in defending them against incursions by the external forces of counterrevolution on the moral, political, economic, and military level. It must be said that this request was legitimate; it was based on the treaty of friendship, good-neighborliness, and cooperation we signed with Afghanistan in 1978. It was also based in international law, specifically in Article 51 of the UN Charter, which envisages "the inalienable right of states to collective and individual self-defense with the aim of warding off aggression." For our part, we warned those concerned that if the aggression did not stop it would not remain the misfortune of the Afghan people, and as you know, we say what we mean.

One more question from this letter: No one has attacked us. Is it worth our getting involved in this business, when our people are dying over there?

[Filatov] It is a good thing that the words not attacked are in the question itself. I would like to say right away that 1941 came about through precisely the same arrangement that some people professed at that time. And what people! Songs were sung about it. When they attack, it is too late to engage them, you have to defend yourself. So this is the question: Where, on what part of our land, at which of our towns, at which of our villages do we rush to the fortifications? The United States thinks the border of its national security passes through Tehran, through Kabul, and through Islamabad. And we? It is obvious the ceaseless armed interventions and the far-reaching plot of the external forces of reaction have created a real threat of Afghanistan losing its independence. This means that the very next day after this loss, it would be transformed into an imperialist military bridgehead on the southern border of our country. As everyone knows, only one thing is done from every military bridgehead: They attack and launch an offensive. People do not take bridgeheads or make them for anything else. This is why the defenders of the Brest Fortress and Stalingrad, Moscow and Leningrad, and the internationalist servicemen from the limited contingent of our troops in Afghanistan stand in the same glorious rank: They bear the very same gold stars of Heroes of the Soviet Union, the very same orders of Lenin, of the Red Banner, of the Red Star, the very same medals for courage. I repeat: When they attack it is too late, it will be 1941. An attack on one's country must be caught as far as possible from the border of the homeland, because on this side of the border lie our land, our towns and villages, our children, wives, fathers, and mothers. [passage omitted]

OVCHINNIKOV IN PRAVDA ON U.S. 'NEOGLOBALISM'

PM050927 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[Political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article: "Neoglobalism -- the Chief Evil on the Path of Progress"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The Grenada operation is considered the first act of the practical implementation of the "Reagan doctrine." It is also called the new globalism or "neoglobalism" strategy although its aims are by no means new. This is a gamble on social revenge on a global scale. This is a desperate attempt to stop the onward march of history and prove that the irreversible can be reversed. Kindled by "neoglobalism," hotbeds of religious conflicts are flaring up in Latin America and Africa. They are surely raging most fiercely in Asia and the adjacent oceans.

The United States has just recently completed the colonial annexation of Micronesia. The Pacific Islands Trust territory, as it is officially called, was transferred to the temporary administration of the United States in 1947. The latter was supposed to prepare the archipelagoes, which were owned by Germany until World War I and by Japan until World War II, for political and economic independence. However, Washington set itself a different goal: to establish itself in Micronesia and make it the rear support for its Far Eastern outposts on the Philippines, Japan, and South Korea so as to keep the entire Asia and Pacific region under threat from new types of weapons. After all, it was Micronesia which once provided the starting point for the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The first U.S. hydrogen bombs were tested on Bikini and Enewetak atolls. The Kwajalein atoll lagoon is used as a target for ICBMs launched in California. It is planned to build important facilties belonging to the "Star Wars" program in Micronesia.

The trust territory was "quartered" so as to be absorbed piecemeal. Last fall, President Reagan announced that three of those quarters -- the Northern Mariana islands, the Marshall islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia -- were granted the status of "commonwealth" or "association" with the United States. Thereby, the Washington administration is imposing a neocolonialist regime on the Micronesia people and preventing them from acquiring genuine independence. Pressure is being increased on the last part of the dismembered Micronesia -- the island of Palau -- with the aim of forcing the local population to accept the proximity of nuclear death contrary to their will.

The annexation of Micronesia is part of the U.S. imperialist circles' broader scheme to turn Asia and the Pacific into yet another arena of military and political confrontation with the USSR, the other socialist countries, and the national liberation forces. As the present Pentagon chief acknowledges, the aim of U.S policy in this part of the world is confrontation with the Soviet Union "from the Persian Gulf to the Aleutian Islands." U.S. strategists want a duplicate of the Atlantic bloc in the Pacific. This scheme presupposes making Japan the key element of an anti-Soviet "eastern front," turning Washington's bilateral military agreements with Tokyo and Seoul into a trilateral one, nipping in the bud the spread of antinuclear feelings in the South Pacific, as well as giving a military-political hue to Pacific integration by involving ASEAN in this closed "community." A graphic illustration of "neoglobalism" is provided by the massive new U.S. pressure on New Zealand, which is threatened with political and economic sanctions for its intention to consolidate in law its refusal to allow ships carrying nuclear weapons to enter its ports.

During the creation of the "eastern front," U.S. imperialism is also striving to make up for the loss of its strategic positions in Southeast Asia (resulting from the failure of the intervention in Vietnam) and in the Persian Gulf (resulting from the downfall of the shah's regime). Deprived of their support in Iran, Washington's strategists gambled on Pakistan aiming to use its territory as a basis for the "undeclared war" against Afghanistan and for intrigues designed to incite civil strife in India.

In south Asia the U.S. ruling circles have long been exploiting conflicts between Pakistan and India. In Southeast Asia they have been trying to maintain a center of tension on the Thai-Kampuchean border. First, so as to impose on Thailand the role of a "Frontline State" and restore the U.S. military presence there. And second, to set the ASEAN members against the Indochinese countries and obstruct dialogue between them. The "Irangate" scandal has again confirmed the U.S. imperialist circles' involvement in fanning regional conflicts in Asia and particularly in prolonging the senseless war between Iran and Iraq.

At the same time the Washington administration is trying increasingly vigorously to make its military bloc allies accomplices in the U.S. adventures in developing countries, above all in Asia. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger recently campaigned once more for the expansion of NATO's operational zone. "We must have the possibility of operating in various parts of the world a considerable distance from the North Atlantic," the Pentagon chief said, trying to convince the West Europeans.

U.S. strategy's heightened interest in regional conflicts is a return to the past. They were in vogue until the ignominious defeat in Vietnam discredited the strategists of counterinsurgency operations. After the overthrow of the shah of Iran, Washington again began saying the time had come to get over the "Vietnam syndrome" and restore the possibility of direct U.S. military intervention in regional conflics. This viewpoint, as the French journal LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE notes, became the U.S. Administration's official policy back in June 1979, when President Carter created the "rapid deployment forces" and ordered the permanent stationing of ships carrying Marines in the Indian Ocean.

Thus, "new globalism" is pursuing aims which are far from new. It is that same old imperial policy spawned by the craving for world domination and hatred of socialism. In conditions of military-strategic parity, imperialism is looking to make counterattacks by roundabout routes and outflanking maneuvers so as to regain the positions it lost in some places while avoiding a frontal clash with the USSR. Thus the doctrine of international banditry, or "neoglobalism," is particularly dangerous to the liberated countries.

U.S. strategists now consider so-called "low intensity conflicts" to be the most likely form of East-West confrontation. To the Pentagon that term means all forms of military actions outside the confines of direct clashes between regular armies: from punitive anti-insurgency operations to the support of antigovernment forces. Asia has had first-hand experience of all this many times. Imperialism stops at nothing in its attempts to reverse the course of history and rob the peoples of the right to determine their own historic path. Its methods include setting states against states, supporting separatists and terrorists, and using economic blockade and enslavement by debt. The pace of the young states' development and their surmounting of the difficulties inherited from the past, M.S. Gorbachev noted during his visit to India, will greatly depend on whether they can properly counter neoglobalism -- the chief evil on the path of world progress. The solution of the truly global problem of disarmament and development, which is so urgent for Asia, will also depend on that.

KOLESNICHENKO ON U.S. POLICY, ALLIED REACTION

PM081830 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[Tomas Kolesnichenko "International Review"]

[Text] Policy or Politicking [subhead]

When assessing any particular event of the present time, we frequently start thinking about future historians. From their enigmatic distance, how will they judge our actions when the passions of the present have long died down; how will they impartially note the truth and the lies of the present time, and its ups and downs?

Thus it was that at M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with prominent U.S. public figures and politicians, he was asked what future historians would say about Soviet-U.S. relations. This was not a fortuitous question. It was not posed by just any people. The U.S. delegation which arrived in Moscow last week contained H. Kissinger, C. Vance, former U.S. secretaries of state; H. Brown, who held the post of defense secretary; J. Kirkpatrick, a former cabinet member and spiritual "father" or rather "mother" of modern conservatism in America -- in a word they are people who so to speak were quite recently shaping history "with their own hands" and even today are not standing aside. Books have, already been written about them. They have given their own assessments in their memoirs. Now the question worrying them is: What next?

To a large extent the fate of mankind depends on the state of Soviet-American relations. Is there, or is there not, to be life on earth -- that is how the age-old question sounds today. Both countries have accumulated a lethal nuclear weapons potential sufficient to annihilate each other and every living thing on our planet many times over. In such case future historians will not be saying anything. There simply will be none. On the other hand, sensible cooperation by the two great powers would be an important motive force for progress and would be marked by great achievements of civilization and would help to solve acute and vital problems of the present time.

Unfortunately, Soviet-American relations for the moment remain at a crossroads and it is necessary to find within oneself the will and strength to turn the corner. The Soviet Union is doing the utmost for this. Its foreign policy proposals do not lay any claim to ultimate truth and are always open to constructive ideas. In our proposals we never forcibly separate our own security from the security of others and we seek to take their opinion into account. If proof of that is required then the Soviet stance at Reykjavik, which became a new stage in the approach to problems of disarmament, can serve as such proof.

What of the United States? What will future historians learn from leafing through the yellowed pages of last week's newspapers? They must direct their attention first and foremost to 3 February. Perhaps this number will be enclosed in a black box on their calendars. In any case many newspapers are already calling it a "sad day" for 1987. On that day the United States conducted at its testing ground in Nevada a nuclear explosion which erased a real opportunity to begin right now the process of eliminating nuclear weapons [kotoryy perecherknul realnuyu vozmozhnost uzhe seychas nachat protsess likvidatsii yadernogo oruzhiya]. After all, this explosion was the response by the Reagan administration to the Soviet unilateral moratorium which has been extended five times (yes, five!) until the first U.S. nuclear explosion in 1987.

The indignation which has just lately been manifested around the world is understandable. "R. Reagan is playing with fire," the French newspaper L'HUMANITE wrote recently. "The American leaders have embarked on a path leading to a precipice." K. McNamara, a member of the British Labor Party's "Shadow Cabinet" called Washington's provocative step "a shameful political step in the cold war spirit." There are many such assessments and a characteristic feature is that no one rejects them, and even among Washington's closest allies there are no overt defenders of such a course to be found. Is this not evidence of the unpopularity of the United States' present policy?

If one considers the Soviet-Amreican aspect of the problem of nuclear tests, it can be bluntly asserted that having refused to join our moratorium, the United States has selected the path of creating hostility and not cooperation. By taking this path it wants to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union which certain U.S. circles consider to be the "focus of evil" merely because our people are building their society not according to U.S.recipes, but according to their own judgment.

We are talking about the "Star Wars" plans, the notorious SDI. Primarily for the sake of this chimera the United States is refusing to end nuclear tests during which it tries out elements of space first-strike weapons. In Ameria itself there is open talk about this, as if about something that is self-evident. But just recently a new element has appeared to which one cannot fail to draw attention.

Thus, when announcing the new explosion in Nevada, the presenter of ABC television news reported imperturbably: "At the present time this is the clearest indication that President Reagan, before leaving the White House in 2 years' time, is trying to secure the deployment [razvertyvaniye] in space of components of his 'Star Wars' program."

Maybe the commentator was mixing something up. After all, even the testing in space of SDI components, not to mention their deployment [razvertyvaniye], is a very crude violation of the ABM Treaty. Moreover this constitutes the torpedoing of the whole process of negotiations on the reduction of strategic rms, a wholesale retreat from Geneva and Reykjavik. Alas, there had been no slip of the tongue here. The Nevada explosion indeed "coincided" with the new fuss surrounding the "Star Wars" plans which Senator Gore in his article in THE NEW YORK TIMES called "yet another ambitious and scoundrely project for selling SDI to the American people by installments."

So what is its essence and meaning? Everything began with the Pentagon chief "suddenly" discovering that work in the sphere of SDI had "progressed so far" that the opportunity had arisen not to wait long years for the implementation of the SDI program as a whole but to deploy [razvernut] in space and to test components of the program individually in the very near future.

R. Reagan immediately took up this idea with enthusiasm. Snow fell in the U.S. capital (which is a very rare occurrence) and, as an NBC correspondent reported on 3 February, "the President threw snowballs on the street although another weapon was on his mind -- whether he should embark on the speediest deployment [rezvertyvaniye] of the 'star wars' antimissile defense." Then followed secret and "semisecret" (with leaks) conferences behind closed doors between the President and his closest advisers and ministers. A maelstrom of rumor began circulating. Weinberger is "insisting," Shultz is "vacillating," Reagan is "inclined," and so forth according to the familiar scenario of Washington "trial balloons" for sounding out the Congress and public opinion.

As happens in such situations, "everything was mixed together" in the White House: patent political calculation and the shameless bluff of politickers. The calculations include imparting irreversibility to the SDI program and binding the denizens of Capitol Hill with a single cord and extorting from them as much money as possible for SDI (what Weinberger is proposing will cost at least 100 billion dollars). This is for domestic consumption.

For foreign consumption there is the attempt to "destabilize" the Reykjavik stance of the Soviet Union, to show "inflexibility" with regard to SDI, even gambling with the fate of the nuclear disarmament talks. The premise for this is the delirious idea that it is allegedly precisely SDI which is coaxing the Soviet Union to the negotiating table. When G. Shultz was asked how a decision to deploy [razvertnut] SDI would affect the talks on arms control, he replied without a second's hestitation: "It is perfectly clear to me that the SDI system can in any case already be deemed to be deployed [razvernutaya] in the sense that it has produced a tremendous impression on the Soviet Union and has become an important consideration in their approach to these talks."

So, judge for yourselves: Is there common sense in this statement or does it reflect the frivolousness of gamblers who have overreached themselves and who, in hope of a win, are raising the stakes in their thoughtless excitement? After all, as Reykjavik showed, it is SDI which is the chief obstacle on the path of the disarmament negotiations. We shall never agree to a radical reduction of strategic arms, not to mention their elimination, if the United States refuses to observe the ABM Treaty. Washington is well aware of this. They also know in Washington that all this fuss surrounding the "phased deployment [razvertyvaniye] of SDI is a complete bluff because according to assessments by experts, even the first phase of SDI (incidentally, it is extremely vulnerable and unreliable) cannot be ready earlier than in 7-10 years' time. So they are simply trying to frighten us. They are trying to frighten us but we are not daunted, for the Soviet Union has strong nerves.

There is one more underlying cause behind this "psychological attack" (there is no other word for it), a purely short-term consideration. It concerns the President himself and his entourage who of late have found themselves in a state of profound crisis. Scandal follows scandal and "Irangate" has not only undermined the President's popularity but is continuing like a maggot to eat away the political stability of Republican rule. Matters have reached the point where Reagan has, for the first time, suffered defeat in the Congress when both the Senate and the House overturned his veto.

All this has turned not so much into a personal, as into a national problem. "Let Reagan be Reagan," his assistants used to repeat when public opinion polls used to show that the smiling President, the "Great Communicator" enjoyed the support of the majority of the population. Under this, crude errors and miscalculations of policy of the entire administration were "written off." So even quite recently journalists would write about this phenomenon thus: "People forgive Reagan anything, and will forget everything — lies great and small, blunders, and crudest mistakes. When he argues about disarmament and asserts that missiles, once launched from submarines can perfectly well be 'brought back,' Americans laugh and forget. They laugh when they learn that during a trip to Latin America he mistook Brazil for Bolivia and even 5 years later he continues to mistake one of the members of his cabinet for the ambassador of a certain European power."

Since "Irangate" people are laughing less and showing indignation more. Although this scandal has not caused the fall of the President, he can no longer halt the avalanche of criticism directed at the administration and the White House. [paragraph continues]

Rapid changes have begun in the President's closest entourage. One after another Reagan is having to sacrifice loyal men who were once his buttress. Poindexter, Speakes, Casey are just the "first swallows." His assistant Buchanan, one of pillars of conservatism, is leaving. There is a scandal surrounding the odious Perle. When in Europe he declared that the idea of a nuclear-free world is "nonsense" and that the European allies of the United States are "chatterboxes and cowards." It is said that he too will retire to write...a novel. Hollywood will, most likely, shoot its latest "horror movie" based on that book.

So the more attention is paid to the White House and to its "kitchen" the more feverishly the people there seek something to which to switch the focus of the public's attention as if to look "tougher" and to display that "inflexibility." "SDI Right Now!" is nothing if not a sensational slogan: So, they say, talk about it, make much of it, and don't go rooting around in "Irangate." All this is lamentable because it is taking place in a great country inhabited by talented people who are worthy of being led by politicians rather than by politickers.

Paying for Hypocrisy [subhead]

This is how sonorous slogans which are trampled in the political mud take their revenge, this is how lies turn into foolhardiness. From the very beginning of its rule, the Reagan administration put forward the high-sounding slogan of "combating terrorism." How many words were expanded, how many times did Washington exhort its allies to join in its "holy war" against this "most pernicious phenomenon of our time."

But also from the very outset, this same administration not only began consorting with terrorists, but also elevated terrorism to the rank of national policy. There are no end of examples -- Grenada, Nicaragua, Libya, Lebanon, and then the notorious "Irangate." It can be said that a new phase of it has now begun. Having disgraced itself in Iran, Washington is casting off the mask and is doing what it long conceived of doing under the pretext of "combating terrorism": It is openly interfering in Near East affairs. The U.S. 6th Fleet is massing in the Eastern Mediterranean. It includes the aircraft carriers John F. Kennedy and Nimitz, and two "enhanced readiness" assault landing groups. Everything indicates that the U.S. military is ready to carry out an "intimidatory raid" on Lebanese territory. As Pentagon spokesman Sims bluntly declared, "we are ready to give support to our friends in the region. Our troops and ships are in a high state of combat readiness."

One knows who counts as Washington's "friends" in this region. Primarily Israel with its aggressive policy against the Arab peoples. But, one may ask, what has Israel got to do with it here? After all, it would seem that the United States is about to free the hostages, of which more than two dozen have accumulated in Lebanon of late. This is how lies win out. You can't help hostages with battleships, but Tel Aviv can. It can also help itself. Especially as overt military interference in the Near East and Persian Gulf has been and still remains a cherished dream of the American "hawks."

Although Washington is officially trying to play down the possibility of a military attack in Lebanon, the threat of it has roused world public opinion. The show of strength has even exasperated the United States' NATO allies. Canada, France, Italy, the FRG, Britain, and Japan, which belong to the "Big Seven," refused to participate in the "Conference on Terrorism" in Rome planned by the White House for 6 February. [paragraph continues]

They stated bluntly that the holding of such a conference is inappropriate in the light of the concentration of 6th Fleet ships in the Mediterranean. A spokesman for France stressed that his country "does not want the Group of Seven to act as world policeman."

This fact, let us state plainly, is unprecedented. It points to the patent changes within NATO, the fall of U.S. prestige among its allies which prefer now to openly dissociate themselves from the most odious steps of Reagan's administration. The ripples from this are spreading from the waters of the Mediterranean all the way to the Potomac. "The West Europeans' reaction," ABC comments, "is a blow to U.S. attempts to restore trust toward itself on the question of terrorism since the Iran scandal."

It is no accident that Israel alone declared that it would "render assistance" to the United States if it strikes against Lebanon. The "gunboat policy" which Washington is trying to pursue under the guise of "punitive operations" against terrorists became obsolete and discredited long ago. The sooner Washington ceases muddying the water of the Mediterranean the easier it will be to solve the difficult and confused issues of ths region. They must be resolved on the lines of broad international cooperation and respect for the rights of all peoples living in this hot spot of the earth.

GORBACHEV TO SPEAK AT NUCLEAR FORUM 16 FEB

LD100531 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1847 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, February 9 (TANJUG) -- Over the coming weekend Moscow will host a meeting of a large number of scientists, writers, artists, and economy representatives of over 80 countries. They are to discuss a nuclear-free world and ways to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe.

As expected, the participants of the "round table" will be received next Monday [16 February] by General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev, who is expected to deliver a speech on the occasion.

The Soviet Union, the organizer of the international forum, has contacted a large number of prominent figures, representatives of various professions. They are to voice their opinions on a world without nuclear weapons and on the outlooks for mankind to avoid a nuclear catastrophe.

As set our by representatives of the organizing committee at a press conference today, over 850 participants from over 80 countries have already confirmed participation. Around 500 Soviet scientists and artists will also take part.

WASHINGTON NEWS CONFERENCE REVIEWS CPSU PLENUM

LD062310 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2220 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Washington, 7 Feb (TASS) -- A news conference on the results of the January plenum of the CPSU Central Committee which took place on Friday at the USSR Embassy in the United States has provoked lively interest among correspondents accredited to Washington.

The news conference was addressed by Vasiliy Borisenkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee; Valentina Parshina, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the auditing commission of the CPSU Central Committee; and Yuriy Dubinin, USSR Ambassador, who spoke of the importance of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the radical renewal which is taking place in the USSR and the broad democratization in all spheres of life. They have also answered numerous questions from U.S. and foreign journalists.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA ON NEWSWEEK 'GLASNOST' FEATURE

PM281435 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jan 87 p 5

[Unattributed article: "A Dose of Candor in the Project of NEWSWEEK Magazine, Which Has Decided To Tell American Readers About the Changes in Our Life"]

[Text] "A Dose of Candor". Under this title NEWSWEEK published in its 12 January issue a large selection of material which, according to the magazine's intention, reflects and analyzes the essence of today's changes in our country. This is understandable. The restructuring of our life is creating intense interest. Joyce Barnathan, chief of NEWSWEEK's Moscow bureau, and correspondent Steven Strasser have noticed quite a few really new and important characteristics in our life, uniting them around a phenomenon seen and felt by them to be the key one: the democratization of our public life, and the growing openness in discussing everything which worries us, and things with which we are dissatisfied in our large home.

"Openness. This word has become the rallying cry. It is the spiritual side of the strategy for renewal," the magazine says. "The dramatic campaign of openness to bring the country into the modern world" is how a note on the table of contents hypes the article. "Openness: The New Watchword" the brash subhead on the cover announces to the reader in sensational fashion.

Why, singling out the main element in the flow of everyday events and finding the basic tendencies is undoubtedly a good intention for the authoritative publication with a circulation of 3 million. This is an attempt within the bourgeois magazine's set limits of objectivity to tell millions of readers in the United States and other foreign countries about matters which we too are all eagerly looking for while leafing through the latest issue of this newspaper.

If we have decided to argue with NEWSWEEK today, then it is not from the positions of the strict pedant enumerating inaccuracies, ignorance of facts and our life's realities, and even deliberate distortions and suppressions. [paragraph continues]

Although all this is easily observed in the selected material, this time let us generously consider them as excusable faults made by foreigners. We are arguing not because the abundance of diverse material, incommensurate in importance and cited to illustrate the basic idea, has the effect of a wide-angle lens: The scale of the picture is displaced, and it becomes indistinct on the periphery.

It is necessary to talk about this publication for two reasons. NEWSWEEK admits that wheatever events its reporters focus on, they notice the new level of social activity, integrity, and openness in the approach to them, and in their discussion, whether it be in the pages of newspapers, on our television screen, in the cinema and theater, in literature, at rallies and meetings -- in a word, everywhere. In confirmation, as has already been said, a great number of various facts have been collected and commented upon, from the serious, for example, the accident at Chernobyl, to an old rehashed anecdote. Side by side stand storeis about the illumination in our press of the economy's development and the related statistics, the new style of conducting press conferences for foreign journalists, problems in agriculture, the fight against abuse of office, alcoholism, and drug addiction, amateur private viewings in a Moscow forest park, an interview with Academician Sakharov, rock group performances, the construction of a memorial on Memorial Hill, and much, much more.

Through the mosaic of our existence one thought is persistently accompanied by the concealed leitmotif and sometimes the open textual refrain: The USSR sees democracy, of course, only as an echo of the Western concept of it. Nobody believes there is any intention of allowing genuine political freedom. Further: "So far the new openness has had well-defined limits..."

NEWSWEEK appears to be ready to acknowledge that we are undergoing genuine, profound changes. According to it they will always remain partial, "balanced," and incomplete. Until that time the magazine, like the great majority of other American publications, does not see any cast-iron guarantees that our changes will lead to "democracy in the West's understanding of it", and it does not acknowledge them as genuine. This is the first thing.

Second, the NEWSWEEK feature is a peculiar example of how the basic changes in our life are also changing Western propaganda in relation to the Soviet Union, how and in what way it must adapt itself, what it has to sacrifice, and in what way it has to update, even if only cosmetically, its cliches and stereotypes.

On the first point, as they say, everything is clear. Hopes for change in the Soviet structure haunt Western politicians and propagandists in the same way obsessions take hold of the insane. It is as if they forget each time that the "delights" of their way of life, their democracy, even if in another, more crude presentation, are historically known to us.

It is precisely these things our people rejected 70 years ago. It is appropriate to say a significant date is also being observed in NEWSWEEK's country -- the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution. As understood in the United States, this is the absolute and perfect embodiment of liberal democracy, the taste of which, to the magazine's regret, we Soviet people are fated not to know.

The comparison of what one type of democracy has managed to achieve in the area of economic, political, social, and personal rights and freedoms in 7 decades, and another in 20, is a separate big topic, but it is typical that NEWSWEEK's reporters do not concern themselves with it at all but simply deplore the fact that we are not like them, and if this is so then what, they say, is the point of all these changes. In each section, in each paragraph of the selection, doubt of success can clearly be heard, a familiar note: Either you become like us, or everything is in vain...

It is essential to talk about and repeat this because, unfortunately, this note has already damaged the hearing of many millions of Americans. According to a public opinion poll conducted last year by ABC-TV in conjunction with THE WASHINGTON POST, two-thirds of those polled honestly admitted their knowledge of the Soviet Union was "not very good or bad," and a little under half stated that it would be good to form a U.S.-type government in Russia too. As Oscar Wilde said, there is no sin except stupidity, and this is a special form of it, cultivated by propaganda.

Joyce Barnathan and Steven Strasser consider the changes observed as a "possible hint of a national transformation, a change from paranoid xenophobia to enlightened modernism". This is an example of how any even relatively innocent exercises in anti-Sovietism run the risk of self-exposure. The encyclopedic dictionary defines xenophobia as fear in the presence of unknown persons, but we use this word when we speak of fear of anything new at all. So, the publication of the writer V. Nabokov's work or jokes with foreign correspondents by the host of a press conference is seen as a dramatic departure from fear of the new, exclusiveness, and self-isolation. It is presented as something unprecedented, although both are quite modest and far from important manifestations of general processes which have been under way in our country for quite some time and quite consistently.

Take, for example, our country's publication of the U.S. writer Gore Vidal's books, the publication of Faulkner's works in a print run of 3 million, the publication of U.S. books in 20 times greater numbers than Russian and Soviet ones in the United States, or the fact that from 30 to 40 U.S. correspondents, including representatives of all three national television companies, are working on a permanent basis and have been working in Moscow for a long time, and that nevertheless the volume of press and television reports on the United States in the USSR is several times greater than in the reverse case — none of this is remarked upon and can in no way be diagnosed as xenophobia.

In sympathetic tones NEWSWEEK lectures on the leadership's strict regulation of the changes, and the availability of openness in small doses. It does not wish to notice the will of a party of many millions lies at the bottom of the occurring changes, tens of millions of people are creating them, and the expectation of directives from above is incompatible with restructuring and openness and most of all contradicts the spirit of the times we are going through.

Yes, today the lie is more subtle but the principle remains the same. The new developments in the country, the changes are compared not against our reality but against the anticommunist stereotype created once and for all time in the Western, particularly the U.S., mind. The reason why our reality, as depicted by them, appears flat, like a medieval painting before the appearance of the Renaissance masters, is because stereotyped patterns instead of real life are still used by Western news media workers.

Although the authors themselves admit it has become easier for journalists accredited to Moscow to meet the leaders of various Soviet departments and to receive information for articles first hand, their own material is densely populated with anonymous authors. "One source said," "another source noted..." The reason for this is clear: Whatever kind of demand you make of the anonymous author, you can attribute to him anything you need in each individual case.

It has already been mentioned that sometimes things which seem quite ordinary to us are interpreted by the NEWSWEEK reporters as a sensation and are presented to the reader in precisely this manner. While preparing the selection in question, Joyce Barnathan visited this newspaper's editorial office. As a result a paragraph called "A Breath of Press Freedom" appeared in the magazine. In it, for example, they call our publication of the complete text of an interview with Kenneth Adelman, the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, an unprecedented step. Elsewhere they speak in the same tone of the favorable showing on television of a New York McDonald's restaurant.

If the authors were to read SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and our press in general, closely, but chiefly without the element of prejudice, and also watch our television, the magazine's eight columns would not suffice for such examples, and more importantly, there would not be enough room for affected amazement. Only recently SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA published an article telling of the successes of the United States telephone network; or a conversation with the famous U.S. sovietologist, Stephen Cohen. The amazement and sensationalism have a covert although very significant function: All the material must create the impression in the U.S. reader's mind that it is not only historic changes taking place in the USSR but the rending of historical fabric, the repudiation of past traditions, and a development which is not only accelerated but is changing social direction.

On the whole the account of the conversation at SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's editorial office on the pages of NEWSWEEK differs tendentiously from what was said in reality. It gives yet one more cause to think about that same measure of candor which became the heading for the big topic on the changes in our life. As we see, for NEWSWEEK this conversation has turned out to be double-edged. What is more, as the saying goes, as with talent and money so with candor: Either it exists or it does not. The U.S. journalists themselves have to measure it out with the chemist's pipette. One can only sympathize with them.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

PM021459 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

["Military-political Review" by observer Colonel M. Ponomarev: "White House Impasses"]

[Text] The publicity ballyhoo was organized according to all the rules of American business. Long before President Reagan delivered the traditional annual report "On the State of the Union" at a joint session of both houses of Congress, the transatlantic mass media devoted many verbose commentaries to it. Apologists for the present Washington administration's policy breathlessly maintained that that message would be almost a manifesto of "faith in a better future" and would illumine the path of America and even the whole world over the coming years.

Then the President's speech was delivered this week. The public was able to familiarize itself with the text of his message. How did it turn out in fact? [paragraph continues]

What prescriptions did the head of the White House write out for American policy, what positions does he champion, and what goals does he set the United States?

Reality Against Rhetoric [subhead]

The first impression from the President's message may probably be formulated like this: an exercise in rhetoric, and nothing more. It contained no end of highfalutin phrases, historical excursions, and magniloquent discourse. All the fine words uttered by the President sounded like a mockery of the American people's hopes and aspirations.

The head of the administration extolled the "achievements" of the U.S. economy. In fact, last year the gross national product increased just 2.5 percent instead of the promised 4 percent. In the last quarter of 1986 the economic growth rate fell to 1.7 percent. On the other hand, the U.S. foreign debt approximately doubled last year and totaled approximately 200 billion dollars, while the foreign trade deficit reached almost 175 billion dollars. The President himself was forced to admit that the level of unemployment remains extremely high, the organization of education does not meet requirements, and health care is so expensive it forces people to "make an intolerable choice between bankruptcy and death." The number of families without a roof over their head doubled during the year.

How is the sick U.S. economy to be cured? The President's prescription is very simple and not original -- reduce the already extremely curtailed spending on Americans' social needs. "We," the message states, "have created a welfare monster." It is necessary to free people from "the dependency of welfare" and make them "self-supporting" -- this is the cynical conclusion of the "manifesto for a better future."

These are the prescriptions concerning domestic policy. They seem still more archaic when it is a question of foreign policy.

In the highfalutin style characteristic of his message the President proclaimed: "We have done much to restore our defenses, our alliances, and our leadership in the world." He essentially justified and extolled the policy of allowing the further raging of militarism and the accelerated implementation of the "Star Wars" program, confirmed the U.S. claims to world hegemony, and lauded the doctrine of neoglobalism and the policy of state terrorism. All this enabled the ABC-TV to conclude the program made public by Reagan is "a classic prescription for political impasses in the coming years."

The events of recent days show the danger of these "impasses" in White House policy. After essentially provoking the new exacerbation of hostilities between Iran and Iraq, the United States has taken advantage of it for the massive concentration of its naval forces in the East Mediterranean, the northern part of the Persian Gulf, and the Arabian Sea. Two carrier-borne formations headed by the aircraft carriers Nimitz and John F. Kennedy have already been deployed there, as well as dozens of other ships. One cannot help recalling here the Pentagon chief's recent words: "America's security begins far from our shores." They conceal the U.S. ruling circles' readiness to interfere directly in the Iran-Iraq conflict to achieve their imperial goals.

Their Credo Is Strength Above All Else [subhead]

The report "On U.S. Strategy in the National Security Sphere," which has just been published on the other side of the ocean, provided a graphic illustration of the main directions of American foreign and direct military policy put before Congress by the President and made concrete Washington's intentions and actions. Commentators evaluate that document, prepared by the National Security Council and addressed to the U.S. Congress on the President's behalf, as the administration's program statement of its positions and aims in foreign and military policy for the next 2 years.

To be brief, the essence of the report may be expounded like this: It is a statement of Washington's intention to continue the previous "position of strength" policy and the "crusade" against the forces of socialism and progress and to pursue a policy of interfering in sovereign states' affairs. In fact, the Washington administration's chief foreign policy aims are proclaimed to be the further buildup of American military might, ensuring unimpeded U.S. access to the oceans and to space, strengthening military blocs and alliances with allies, and increasing pressure on the Soviet Union by using all means available to the United States.

The report describes the instruments with whose help the White House is implementing and intends to continue implementing its policy. It is a question of military force, blackmail of sovereign states, and generous dollar handouts to clients. The continuation of the program for the "rearmament of America," which the Reagan administration has begun and which is based on the further improvement of offensive strategic forces and also the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," is named as the U.S. "top priority" in the military sphere.

The entire contents of that report, as well as Reagan's message "On the State of the Union," irrefutably attest that Washington's credo is strength above all else. This conclusion cannot be shaken by both documents' references to a desire to establish "more constructive relations" with the Soviet Union and for arms control. They are set about with a number of conditions, particularly "a change in Soviet conduct around the world." The President's documents do not contain even a hint the United States is prepared to change its own obstructionist stance at the talks on limiting nuclear and space arms and to stop destroying the treaties signed earlier between the USSR and the United States. He further permitted himself to declare: "It would be extremely dangerous to expect success in the arms control process."

The claims to world hegemony and the gamble on the arms race find material embodiment in the steady growth of U.S. military spending. The President demanded in a really ultimatum-like form that the congressmen on no account cut back his request for appropriations for military purposes to the tune of $312 billion in Fiscal 1988. In the future it is proposed to increase them by no less than $20 billion annually.

There is no need here to examine the Pentagon's specific military programs. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA regularly tells readers about them. I would, however, like to emphasize that not only a quantitative arms buildup but also their qualitative improvement are being implemented. Various systems of so-called high-precision weapons designed to inflict a first, disarming strike against an enemy are being created [sozdat] and adopted, and a new, third generation of nuclear arms is being developed [razrabatyvat]. All this leads to undermining the strategic equilibrium now existing in the world and creates a dangerous growth of tension.

In the light of these facts Reagan's warnings to Congress attract attention. He fears the legislators might curtail some of the military programs advanced by the administration, considering them excessive and too burdensome for the already overstrained budget. The President warns he will veto "any attempt to undermine our national security."

And What of Common Sense? [subhead]

An unprecedented incident occurred recently in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. Two weeks after Democrat Congressman L. Aspin was removed from the post of chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he was re-elected to that post. What had happened? The point is that previously Aspin had supported the "Star Wars" plans, the deployment of MX missiles, and aid for the Nicaraguan contras. His position had come into conflict with present sentiments in the Democratic Party. Aspin realized he could no longer adhere to his former, too conservative views. The congressman publicly renounced them, and he was given back his former post -- one of the most important in the House of Representatives.

What happened to Aspin shows that support for the White House course is growing weaker even among congressmen. This is still more noticeable in broad public circles. Thus, public opinion polls attest to appreciable changes in the sentiments of Americans. In a recent poll conducted by ABC-TV and THE WASHINGTON POST, 56 percent of those questioned declared the country was on the wrong path, and only 36 percent approved of the administration's foreign policy. The press is increasingly frequently carrying articles by prominent figures who urge the White House to abandon the policy of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. A recent article on this topic was written by such an authoritative U.S. figure as former Defense Secretary R. MacNamara.

Well, then, is the common sense so characteristic of Americans winning? No, it would be premature, to say the least, to draw such a conclusion. It would be more correct to say today this common sense still yields to crude pressure of force. Stereotypes which have become established over many decades are too firmly rooted in the Americans' consciousness. Anti-Soviet, anticommunist propaganda plays its part. As those same polls show, the number of people who profess anticommunism is not falling. This enables the ruling circles to continue having it their own way. It is not without reason the President's message to Congress plays considerable tribute to hardened anti-Sovietism and to attempts to hold our country responsible for the tense state of affairs in the world and, in particular, for the failure in Reykjavik and at the disarmament talks.

A discrepancy between rhetoric and reality -- this is the general impression created by Reagan's "State of the Union" message to Congress. The President's rhetoric cannot obscure the essence of the policy he advocates -- an offensive against the living standards of the people inside the country for the sake of enriching those who are already rich, and the desire for hegemony in the world arena and continued confrontation with the USSR in the foreign policy sphere. This is why that message, which contains no new ideas, has prompted such a critical attitude to it. Washington's old prescriptions can in no way help the modern, rapidly changing world.

BELYAYEV ON U.S. SOVIETOLOGISTS' 'CHIMERAS'

PM041440 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 Feb 87 p 9

[Igor Belyayev "Observer's Opinion" article: "Realities, Not Chimeras"]

[Text] I have often heard and even read that American sovietologists had all but calculated in advance and even studied the "impasse" situation in the Soviet Union in the late seventies.

Apparently much of what they spoke and wrote about we ourselves are saying today, in one form or another. Yes and no! The American sovietologists were unable to calculate in advance the main, decisive thing. I mean the ability of the present leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet Union to grasp the situation which had arisen in the party and the country and once again direct their development along an ascending line. The American sovietologists made no such realistic predictions. Over there, they claimed, the economy has declined so much the United States and the West have nothing about which to worry. The Russians have hopelessly lost the competition with capitalism as an economic system! Japanese sovietologists echoed them. "The Soviet Union has fallen behind Japan forever!" one of them observed. In the social sphere, American sovietologists believed, things are also bad in the USSR. Disastrously bad! In a little while everything the Soviet Union once boasted of to the West will crumble into dust. The world will witness the collapse of world socialism. Therefore, the American sovietologists believed, the United States can and must treat the Soviet Union as a third-rate country and demand from it whatever behavior in the world arena would suit the West. So that was the start of the global policy of the "new conservatives," whose people took over the White House in 1981.

I am convinced that that is why neither Geneva nor Reykjavik, two Soviet-American summit meetings in a row, produced positive results. Despite Moscow's readiness for far-reaching agreements. Washington gambled nonetheless on a hard line in relation to the Soviet Union.

Let me remind you it is no accident that from the very beginning of Ronald Reagan's term of office his speeches have been sprinkled with stereotypes like the "evil empire" or the "inevitable collapse of socialism as a system." In fact these stereotypes reflected the mood of the American ruling establishment. It felt the United States had no need to make any special efforts to bring about our downfall. Time is Washington's main ally. The Soviet Union, eroded by insoluble problems within and the inability to overcome stagnation, is supposedly about to start collapsing into ruins.

All at once there was the January plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which boldly continued the strategic line elaborated at the 27th CPSU Congress, which was discussed energetically after the CPSU Central Committee April plenum. How it continued! Formally, it discussed a single question — "The Restructuring and the Party's Cadre Policy." In effect, in M.S. Gorbachev's report and in the course of the discussion, the plenum participants answered the question "Restructuring — To Be Or Not To Be?" Yes, to be, and it will give mighty impetus to the economically highly developed Soviet Union.

I can imagine the colossal astonishment and even stupefaction with which American sovietologists greeted the results of the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum in Moscow. [paragraph continues]

They could not even conceive of the open, keen, and concrete approach to all the problems presented there, without exception. Incidentally, it was from the plenum materials that our friends the Sovietologists learned about some of these problems in full for the first time.

The party came to the conclusion that the continuation of "antidevelopment" is death, that only the frank acknowledgement of negative processes both within the country and in the CPSU will help to create the conditions for overcoming extremely pernicious phenomena and for restructuring. The restructuring of all our work, of the whole of Soviet society, so as to ensure the accelerated, progressive development of party and state. Like all my compatriots, I am increasingly confident that we will impose order in our home. Yes, the tremendous work which lies ahead will require all our efforts. There will be order -- of that there is no doubt! This means our foreign policy too, which is based on socialism, and not on utopian dreams, will be active. Perhaps most importantly -- it will accord with the situation which has arisen in the world.

What about Ronald Reagan and his sovietologists? Giving the "State of the Union" messge to Americans at precisely the time of the CPSU Central Committee January plenum, the U.S. President once again resorted to anti-Sovietism and anticommunism and continued to move in the wrong direction, away from realities and toward the chimeras which the Sovietologists thrust his way. The Soviet Union is restructuring itself, which creates a fundamentally new situation in the world. Washington has received such a powerful signal from the important changes which have begun in our country that it will have to react. Otherwise the existing difficulties can only be exacerbated. Yes, difficulties for U.S. policy. To those who determine, formulate, and implement major policy in Washington, I would like to say just one thing, to give them good for thought. Today, after the great event in Moscow:

"Gentlemen, it is time to be guided by realities! Away with your groundless predictions. Let us act as equals, above all in what matters most -- in preventing universal catastrophe, which even the U.S. President opposes verbally."

MOSCOW WEEKLY INTERVIEWS POLAND'S CARDINAL GLEMP

PM041012 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 Feb 87 p 14

[Report by special correspondent Leonid Pochivalov on visit to Warsaw, and interview with Cardinal Jozef Glemp, primate of Poland: "'The Concept of Peace Is the Same for Everyone'" -- date of interview not given]

[Excerpts] [Pochivalov report] [Passage omitted] I wandered through Warsaw with a well known Polish writer and, on Krakowskie Przedmiescie street, we looked in at a church, one of the main sights of the Polish capital -- Chopin's heart is immured in the church wall. My companion, on entering the church, hurriedly crossed himself. I was startled: After all, he is a PZPR member, he belongs to a party which bases its activity on Marxist-Leninist teaching! How can these things be combined?

But that's how it is -- they are combined! That is Poland. Both understandable and unexpected I am from another country, but a nearby, neighboring country, historically linked with Poland over the centuries; our countries are good friends, belong to a united socialist fellowship, and are united in the quest for guidelines to the future that are of equal significance for us. We have much in common, but a great deal that is dissimilar. And that which is dissimilar, that which is purely Polish, must always be taken into account and regarded as a reality, as an obvious fact of history and of the present day, if we want -- and of course we do want -- to know each other better and therefore understand each other better.

Every time I go to Moscow, I meet with Colonel Stanislaw Kwiatkowski, a scholar and a talented publicist. He heads the Center for the Study of Public Opinion. This is an important institution which operates with scientific independence and military efficiency. It is directly subordinate to the tasks of political leadership of the country, and I am convinced that the data which Kwiatkowski has at his disposal reflect the real situation in Poland.

On this occasion, we began to discuss new aspects of the relationship between church and state. This relationship is of a general nature, so to speak. After all, approximately 82 percent of the country's population are believers. There are many believers among young people, and quite a few among the intelligentsia. Kwiatkowski noted: People in Poland have ceased to e surprised at the fact that a significant number of PZPR members also write "believer" on questionnaires and no longer try to conceal this fact in embarrassment. We find this incomprehensible. Over the years of Soviet power, the conviction has grown that adherence to religion is evidence of cultural and intellectual backwardness. Yet even Communists...a paradox? There is no other word for it. But it is a reality and one that must be reckoned with. This is required by the new political thinking, which we are calling on others to adopt, too.

Poland is one of the most important bulwarks of Catholicism in the world, and in terms of the number of believers, the church here is considerably larger than in age-old Catholic countries like Spain and Italy. The Polish clergy has a powerful apparatus for influence with tens of thousands of officials united by strict discipline; it publishes mass editions of newspapers, journals, and books; and enjoys prestige among the masses. This prestige is no recent creation -- it is derived from the past. The Polish church long supported patriotic movements in the country, promoting the unification of Poland, and during World War II, it was on the side of the Poles who fought against fascism. It is a great force, and for Poland's future, the direction in which this force is pointed is important.

If people abroad are talking about a Pole, they often apply the stereotype: "A Pole is a Catholic." Moreover, bourgeois propaganda in the West invariably imposes the view that in Poland a believer, by virtue of the very fact of his belonging to the church, inevitably must be in opposition to the socialist state. This assertion is false. In the postwar years, under Communists leadership, Poles, united in patriotic, under Communists leadership, Poles, united in patriotic, creative labor and having faith in the future, successfully laid the foundation for the creation of a socialist society, and yet the majority of Polish working people were believers. Stanislaw Kwiatkowski is convinced that Polish religion is by no means as fanatical as is customarily believed. "Polls show," Kwiatkowski said, "that today the majority of Poles are in favor of continuing socialist building in Poland. Asked whether people with entirely opposite attitudes toward religion can fully understand each other, the vast majority of those polled answered in the affirmative."

However, it must not be forgotten that there are forces in Poland which seek to turn the church into a political opponent of the state. The church is constantly incited to such actions by certain reactionary circles in the West. It is at their instigation that certain religious figures use the pulpit for frankly political opposition speeches. But Kwiatkowski believes that they are acting against the will of the believers. He observed: "In the opinion of the vast majoirty in society, the activity and position of the Catholic Church does not require it to be set against the state. Moreover, conflict-free cooperation, beneficial to the whole of society, is possible within the sphere of common interests." Many people told me the same thing in Poland.

Do such common interests exist? Of course! What could be more sacred than the protection of life on earth? The Catholic Church is an influential force in many countries, and in our time, when mankind faces the threat of finding itself on the brink of the abyss, the church's peacemaking contribution could be weighty.

Our philosophy is incompatible with that of the church. But it does not reject by any means collaboration in matters aimed at truly benefiting mankind. During my stay in Poland, a conference of secretaries of the Central Committee of the socialist countries' fraternal parties was taking place in the capital. The conference discussed today's most urgent problems, including the struggle for peace. The conference communique stressed: "Ideological, political, and philosophical differences should be no obstacle to cooperation in the struggle for these goals. What unites individual forces is of paramount significance, not what divides them."

It was on the basis of this premise that I requested an audience with one of the most important religious leaders of today, Jozef Cardinal Glemp, head of the Polish Catholic Church and primate of Poland. To be honest, I did not have much hope of success in my intention. I knew the cardinal avoids contact with journalists, whatever viewpoints they represent. I was told that the head of the Polish church has already received representatives of the Soviet press more than once, as well as representatives of the socialist countries' mass media in general. And the fact that, all the same, he did agree to meet with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's correspondent was assessed as a remarkable event both in Poland and abroad. Certain Western radio stations even hurried to report it.

The cardinal received me in his Warsaw residence. The cardinal's secretary, a young priest who speaks Russian well, was present during our talk. The priest placed his dictaphone on the table and then I placed mine next to it -- in a conversation like this, accurate reporting is important.

Then into the room came a thickset man of average height, dressed in a long black cassock and with a large cross on his chest. His head was bedecked with a round red cap -- the sign of the high office of cardinal. Before me was the man whom millions of Poles acknowledge as their spiritual mentor. At first his face appeared stern and veiled with will and inflexibility shining through the firm gaze of his small dark eyes.

I introduced myself. The cardinal said that he first met Soviet people many years ago, when he was a child. His home town was liberated from the Hitlerites by units of the advancing Soviet Army. Soldiers came into his house to ask for a place to spend the night. He recalled how these stern servicemen smiled at his little sister.

This childhood memory helped our conversation to get onto a less official footing from the first. Then the secretary priest and I simultaneously pressed the buttons of our dictaphones.

[Interview begins] J. Glemp: I am glad to meet a journalist from the Soviet Union. I have been to the USSR as a tourist in my time. During my visit I saw a high level of culture in your country. And not once did I detect any unfriendliness toward Poles. I believe that friendship, an understanding of every people's interests, and respect for their culture and their historical traditions form the basis for normal coexistence between peoples. And that is the gurantee of peace.

L. Pochivalov: Could you please give your assessment of the situation in the world today, Your Eminence. Is the danger of universal catastrophe a real one, in your opinion?

J. Glemp: Today every person on earth is aware of the great forces that are participating in the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. And that cannot but lead to an awareness of danger. Fear of the possible use of these weapons is gripping more and more people. I have been to the United States and many other countries and I know that the fear of war has become ubiquitous. But I do not think that in this situation, when great nuclear forces exist, people can permit war to occur. The guarantee that we nevertheless can count on peace is the existence of approximate equilibruim in arms -- that is on the one hand; on the other hand, there is people's univeral desire for peace. These two elements do not, however, provide an absolute guarantee of security, because a universal catastrophe could occur due to some madman.

L. Pochivalov: It need not happen only because of a madman. We are living in the computer age, and a computer can go wrong. There is much in our lives that is entrusted to machines. The problem of an unexpected fatal mistake by a machine is dealt with today more and more frequently by writers and artists in their work. Shortcomings of some kind in machinery could lead to major catastrophes. This was confirmed by the loss of the American spaceship Challenger and the events at Chernobyl. This means that machinery must not be relied on too much.

J. Glemp: That is true. People who handle machinery must be trained to be fully responsible for it, because there is always human error behind a catastrophe. This is extremely important when people are dealing with machinery capable of causing disaster. In this case, people must be especially responsible.

L. Pochivalov: Do you believe, Your Eminence, in mankind's ability to save itself from self-destruction? If so, what is the basis for your conviction that people can conquer evil in themselves? What is the relationship between the basic dogmas of Christianity and the task of delivering mankind from military madness?

J. Glemp: The Catholic Church shares the universal conviction that the world can be protected from catastrophe. Indeed, we must seek peace by all available methods. One method is the political method. This is up to the authorities in individual countries. Another is the moral striving to educate man to respect ethical principles. That is a very important task for all churches. We believers talk above all about human consciousness and attention to other people. An argument of the utmost importance in our teaching is love, which is expressed even toward an enemy. That is a very difficult matter. It requires that people be educated from the very first with a view to curbing their negative tendencies to evil and anger. I think the church has already done something in this sphere. Let me remind you of Pope John XXIII''s encyclical on peace; this is a very important doctrine. And now every 1 January the pope delivers a speech in favor of peace, because 1 January has been declared Peace Day; there have already been 20 such speeches. Our principles with regard to peace are not so much political as moral.

L. Pochivalov: But I know your actions include not only preaching but concrete actions, like the well-known Assisi meeting. Representatives of various faiths met in that Italian city to speak with one voice of their concern for the fate of peace and their willingness to help defend it. Is not that a political action?

J. Glemp: These actions are above all conversations with others -- dialogues. Meetings like Assisi are of great significance in consolidating the forces of peace. Much significance is also attached to other antiwar actions, such as demonstrations in defense of peace, especially in capitalist countries.

L. Pochivalov: The outstanding Soviet physicist and Nobel Prize winner, academician P.L. Kapitsa, in a conversation with me as a representative of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA not long before his death, said that morality in the world lags behind the development of science and technology. Morally, people have not yet caught up with many of their achievements, and in nuclear power, in particular. Man long since has gone into space and creates machines that think, but has not yet managed to improve himself to meet the demands of the age. Crime, drug addiction, terrorism, and irresponsibility on the part of certain politicians and statesmen are growing in the world. Do you agree that only man can stop war?

J. Glemp: Certainly.

L. Pochivalov: Last year, here in Warsaw, at an exhibition in defense of peace, I saw a small picture which made a powerful impression; I do not remember the artist's name; the picture showed a desert. In the foreground was a stone sculpture of a man, several meters high, fashioned according to the ancient models. At its foot was the tiny figure of the sculptor. He had flung aside his chisel and was sitting on a stone, exhausted. He is clearly in despair. The sculptor's creation, which he had carved out over endless days, was cracked from its head to its base. So man was unable to create man. I saw this picture as the embodiment of the sentiments which exist in the world today. What does Your Eminence think about such feelings?

J. Glemp: I can confirm with conviction the concern of your physicist. Man has indeed come a long way in technology. Even a child can drive a car, a tractor, a tank. However, he cannot find his way in dealing with other people. The rapid development of technology does not, unfortunately, make people any better. That is why we say that ethics must prevail over technology. I have frequent contact with many people. When I meet with humanitarians, I can sense that pessimism prevails among them. But when I talk with people involved with technology, for instance professors at polytechnical institutes, I can sense more optimism. [paragraph continues]

And not because these people believe in the power of their technology, but rather because a return to ethical problems can be observed among them. And that is very reassuring because technology is only a good thing for man himself has his dignity. So it is my deep conviction that the church's activity in the ethical sphere is complementary to political efforts.

L. Pochivalov: Including efforts to defend peace?

J. Glemp: Of course, that is what I am talking about.

L. Pochivalov: Is the Catholic Church ready to cooperate with other political and nonpolitical movements in the cause of the defense of peace? What potential might exist for such cooperation?

J. Glemp: I believe the concept of peace is the same for everyone. What is peace? It is a universal good. If many people seek that good, then nautrally they must show good will toward each other. Here in Poland we do not form any specially organized groups of believers in defense of peace, but our people's desire for peace is very strong. My generation remembers what war is. At the beginning of our meeting I mentioned Poland's liberation by the Soviet Army, but I also remember 1939, when the Hitlerite occupation began. I remember how our people were taken away to concentration camps, how they were shipped off to Germany to do forced labor, how we were thrown out of our homes. And we do not want a repetition of that. I believe our priests think the same way. After all, during the war, one-half of the priests in the eparchy where I was born were killed.

L. Pochivalov: I have read that not one Polish Catholic priest cooperated with the Hitlerites.

J. Glemp: I have not heard of any such case.

L. Pochivalov: What do you think about the prospects for humanitarian cooperation? What form could contacts take with different ideologies, which also come out in defense of peace? I would like to give an example. A movie called "Ascent" ["Voskhozhdeniye,"] devoted to the tragedy of war, was once released in the USSR. Its creator was the young director Larisa Shepitko, who unfortunately, died in a car accident. She told me that she was awarded a Vatican prize for this movie. So can points of contact be found in what is most important for mankind -- the attitude to war and peace?

J. Glemp: I seem to remember this move was shown here in Poland.

L. Pochivalov: It was based on a story by the Belorussian writer Vasil Bykov.

J. Glemp: Yes, the movie was shown here, but under a different title -- "Ascension" ["Vozneseniye"].

L. Pochivalov: Perhaps. I mentioned this movie as an example of how we can seek more and more new opportunities for such contacts in the humanist sphere.

J. Glemp: Of course we should seek such opportunities, we have opportunities like dialogue. This can be extended to other forms of contact like symposiums, exhibitions, and the development of tourism.

L. Pochivalov: In this connection, Your Eminence, I would like to move on to another matter. What is your attitude to the call for a new political thinking, based on the realities of today to be established in international relations?

J. Glemp: To be honest, I don't really understand the question. It seems to me that thinking is either right or wrong. If it is wrong, then it assesses reality incorrectly, and if it is right, it understands what reality actually is. That is why real information is so important. When one people is dealing with another, it must know the whole truth about that other people. Yet propaganda sometimes expounds only one truth; this is detrimental to the cause. I therefore believe that full and truthful information is very important. Through truth we reach mutual understanding. And from there it is not far to universal peace.

L. Pochivalov: Pope John Paul II recently said that the Catholic Church is worried about the unfavorable economic situation in the world and the growing backwardness of many countries. I lived for some years in Africa and Asia and saw children dying of hunger; I remember seeing one Catholic missionary weeping because he could not save a dying child. Some -- economically developed -- countries are moving ever forward, while others lag further and further behind. And I think we have started talking about a new way of thinking in our day, because the desire has arisen to make that political thinking more democratic and closer to reality.

J. Glemp: Yes. In our language we call that justice. The new way of thinking is a question of how to understand justice on a global scale. The basis of everything is the awareness that all people are equal. And not only equal. Man must create a fellowship of men, so that they grow closer to each other. So the incorrect, unfair division of what the earth provides, the existence of conditions, whereby on some contents children are dying of hunger -- that is the greatest injustice, that is mankind's great sin. And, of course, it is directly related to the problems of the defense of peace.

L. Pochivalov: The arms race has taken away the potential for combating drought. It is the arms race that is responsible for children dying of hunger...

J. Glemp: Yes, that is true.

L. Pochivalov: The USSR has put forward a proposal to totally eliminate nuclear weapons by the end of this century, to make the new century a century without weapons or wars, and to resolve all international conflicts exclusively by nonviolent means. Do these proposals meet with support in the Catholic church?

J. Glemp: I do not fully understand this problem. I only know that the question is very complex. One may, of course, wish for there to be no weapons on the planet by the year 2000, but there are the realities of our time, which show that this is a difficult question. It must evidently be done in stages. First, stop the further growth of arms. For me, it is always a mystery: Why is this not done? I think the arms race has spread to so many spheres that all kinds of opportunities to arm oneself have arisen. If one side sees that the other side has overtaken it in a certain sphere of arms, it seeks to make up the lost ground. This means that first of all we must declare resolutely: An end to all arms! And then reduce the arms stockpiles which exist. This means dialogue, constant dialogue -- at the highest political level.

L. Pochivalov: Your Eminence, how do you assess the Reykjavik meeting? Do you see positive aspects to it?

J. Glemp: I think it was a beginning.

L. Pochivalov: How do you regard the call for a total end to nuclear weapon tests?

J. Glemp: I suppose that is the same thing as stopping further armament. I am astonished that people can test weapons that are designed for the mass destruction of people.

L. Pochivalov: What is your view of the appeal made by M.S. Gorbachev for the creation of a world without weapons, a nonviolent world?

J. Glemp: I do not think anyone would not share that opinion. But the point is that trust between people has not yet been created. People do not believe what is said. To this end, a process of education is needed, and we wish to work on that.

L. Pochivalov: A last question -- on ecological problems. With economic growth, there is an ever increasing threat to nature on our planet. What is the Catholic Church's attitude to this danger? Does it worry you?

J. Glemp: Yes, indeed. And this too is connected with the protection of life. The two problems are closely related. When we talk about the danger of nuclear war, we are thinking about the future. But a polluted environment is killing us today. We in Poland have considerable problems in this respect. We have certain regions which are in a dangerous ecological condition. Especially the air and water. If arms potentials were to be reduced now! After all, rediation can kill nature. This is why Chernobyl was a great warning to the whole world, a reminder that we must handle the great forces of nature with care. Here once again we come back to the point that ultimately everything depends on man, who must be open both to other people and to the world of nature. Only by including ecological problems among the problems of protecting the world can we have a complete picture of the present-day situation.

L. Pochivalov: I would like to conclude our conversation on an optimistic note. I told you about the picture I saw at an exhibition in Warsaw, embodying the sense of hopelessness about the future. Let us hope that this is not our future after all.

J. Glemp: Yes! We, as believers, have a more optimistic view of the future, because we believe that God rules the world, and we want to work with God's great teaching and seek means of achieving this goal, which are within man's power. I believe that the prayers for peace heard in every church are of great significance.

L. Pochivalov: Allow me to thank Your Eminence for your attention.

J. Glemp: I too am glad that you came. We need such contacts. I wish you new creative successes in your literary work, which strengthens the friendship between our peoples.

FRG PARTIES' VIEW ON EAST-WEST TIES ASSESSED

LD091906 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Feb 87

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Georgiy Zubkov; Vladimir Kondratyev video report]

[Text] [Video shows Kondratyev in studio facing camera] After the battles of the preelection campaign, the breakdown of political forces in the coming 4 years is well-known, but tranquillity has not descended upon the West German capital.

The outcome of the election, in which the conservative parties, despite their expectations, suffered palpable losses, has weakened their position within the ruling coalition. Coalition negotiations have begun and promise to be very stubborn. The Christian Democratic Union [CDU], Christian Social Union, [DSU], and the Free Democratic Party [FDP] make up an alliance which is far from a smooth-running operation. At the same time, there is a manifest discord between the CSU and a group of extreme right wingers from the CDU on the one hand, and the FDP on the other, as far as the so-called Ostpolitik, disarmament, and arms control are concerned.

The West German voters made it known that they do not want a return to the Cold War era. They perceive a counterbalance to the dangerous trends in the preservation and further development of the course that is defended by Free Democrat Genscher. [Video shows brief shots of officials; a black and white photo of a B-52 bomber; Genscher addressing a conference]

Speaking the other day at a forum on the world economy in Davos, Switzerland, the minister of foreign affairs called for an unprejudiced look at the processes under way in the Soviet Union and its proposals regarding international affairs. It is a dangerous illusion to think that the Soviet Union's proposals are dictated by considerations of its weakness. A policy derived from a position of strength, a striving toward superiority, attempts to drive it into a corner through an arms buildup -- these catagories of thought must be consigned to the past, Genscher thinks.

Woerner, Christian Democrat and Minister of defense, has a different idea: In Munich, at the annual conference of the Wehrkunde [military studies] Socity, he stressed that there can be no talk of the nuclear denudation of Europe. [video shows brief shots of conference in progress, showing Woerner captioned in German as "Woerner, CDU, defense minister" in close-up; then showing Strauss, speaking -- no caption]

Woerner's reasoning is developed by Strauss; he makes assertions about the overwhelming superiority of the Soviet Union in short-range missiles and demands that this problem be linked with the achievemewnt of any solution on medium-range missiles. Strauss expresses the interests of the military-industrial complex, and welcomes SDI.

The Social Democrats [video shows man captioned as "Egon Bahr, Spd", speaking], who also took part in the Wehrkunde conference, draw the conclusion from what the representatives of the ruling camp say that in the coming years the government for the most part will continue to take a negative stand in response to concrete moves for disarmament.

A process of rethinking of a number of strategic aims is in progress in the SPD following th election. [video shows Brandt and Kohl with three others, unidentified, speaking on what appears to be a television discussion program]

A change in the party's leadership is in the offing. Willy Brandt has announced that he intends to leave the post of chairman in 1988, and now the two most likely candidates are being named. They are Hans-Jochen Vogel and Oskar Lafontaine, 43-year-old minister president of the Saarland government. [Video shows Lagontaine, captioned, speaking in close-up] It is possible that he will be a candidate for chancellor at the next election. Lafontaine has stated that the Johannes Rau's stand of having no alliance with the Greens was wrong. In the final analysis, he says, the social Democrats and the Greens have a lot in common on problems such as disarmament.

The days after the elections in the FRG have been marked by contradictions. [video shows Kondratyev at outdoor location] Whose line will gain the upper hand? That of the extreme right, or of those who are in favor of a new approach in relations between East and West? It must not be forgotten that, according to West German legislation, the adoption of final decisions is the chancellor's responsibility. Helmut Kohl, who, in the view of observers, has still not recovered from the relative failure of his party, is keeping in the background for the time being. At his preelection meetings, he promised the voters a fruitful dialogue with the Soviet Union. The time has come to put the promise into practice. What now, Mr Kohl? DER SPIEGEL magazine, and the West Germans are asking. [video shows a still of DER SPIEGEL cover]

IZVESTIYA LINKS THULE RADAR MODERNIZATION TO SDI

PM091235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Sychev dispatch under the rubric "Pertinent Remarks": "What Is the Real Reason for Modernizing the Radar?"]

[Text] Stockholm -- The radar station at the U.S. military base at Thule, northwest Greenland is the subject of a keen political debate that has flared up in Denmark in the last few days.

Parties in opposition to the center-right cabinet of Danish Prime Minister P. Schlueter have expressed concern that modernization of the radar is part of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) program and consequently undermines the Soviet-U.S. 1972 ABM Treaty.

The continuing arms race which, with Washington's "Star Wars" plans, threatens to extend to outer space, increases the danger of a nuclear conflict breaking out. This gloomy prospect has spurred the Folketing to pass a number of resolutions in recent years which state, in particular, Denmark's desire to contribute to strengthening peace and to help preserve the unlimited duration of the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty and its refusal to become involved in the SDI program. Washington's plans in Greenland are, therefore, a clear blow to Denmark's foreign policy principles.

Danish newspapers write that there are plans to equip the radar station in Thule with the "Pave Paws" phased array system. This will make it possible to increase the station's range to approximately 5,000 kilometers. On the completion of this work, the potential of the radar complex will be enhanced, which, however Pentagon officials may try to justify the actions of their chiefs, will be at variance with the treaty conditions.

It is noteworthy that American congressmen officially admitted this fact by turning down plans for reconstruction in Thule in 1980. They presented their views at the time in a law on the state budget. However, in July 1983, U.S. President R. Reagan amended this decision and gave the go-ahead for the modernization.

So what changed in the period between these events? A great deal, it seems. As is well known, several months earlier, in March to be precise, President R. Reagan made a speech in which he presented his so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." Washington adopted a course aimed at beginning a new stage in the arms race, one of the elements of which is the modernization of the entire U.S. radar network, in Thule in particular, as well as in the small town of Fylingdales in Britain. The purpose of this is obvious -- to ensure that the ground-based ABM systems now being created [sozdavat] in the United States at a rapid rate will home in on their target. They are links in the same chain.

To this must be added, of course, the fact that, by openly violating the ABM Treaty and also the SALT II treaty, those across the ocean are trying to involve their North Atlantic allies in White House policy.

Official Protest

AU061708 Paris AFP in English 1705 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Copenhagen, Feb 6 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union has officially protested to the Danish charge d'affaires in Moscow over the installation of a new U.S. radar system at Thule in northern Greenland, officials said here Friday.

The Soviet protest claimed the new Phased Array Radar, set to begin operating next summer at a cost of about 125 million dollars, would violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty, the officials said.

According to a clause in the treaty, the superpowers can only set up anti-ballistic-missile radar stations on their own territory or in bordering areas.

Greenland is a self-governing territory of Denmark.

Moscow also rejected Washington's assertions that the new system would merely modernize the existing radar station at Thule. "It is not a modernization, but the construction of a new radar," the protest note said.

Denmark's left-wing opposition has also criticized the new radar station as being a violation of the ABM treaty. The issue has recently led to heated debates in the Danish parliament.

IZVESTIYA REVEALS FRENCH 'SPY SATELLITE' PROGRAM

PM091413 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Yu. Kovalenko Paris dispatch under the rubric "Reports From Abroad": "Spy Satellites"]

[Text] France has begun work on its "Helios" military program to launch spy satellites.

The first satellite will be launched with the aid of an Ariane rocket in 1998 as part of this program, which will costa total of 7.5 billion francs and will continue for the next 10 years. The firms Matra, Aerospatiale, Alcatel-Thomson, and others will be involved in the program as well as the Defense Ministry and the National Space Research Center.

At present France obtains this kind of information from the United States. According to the newspaper LE FIGARO, Paris intends to organize cooperation with Bonn and exchange intelligence obtained using satellites. Another step will thereby be taken on the road to West European military integration.

Work has simultaneously begun here to create [sozdaniye] the "Syracuse-2" military telecommunications system to provide fixed communications with ground forces, the Air Force, and the Navy, including submarines equipped with nuclear weapons.

U.S., UK BLAMED FOR TENSION IN MEDITERRANEAN

LD070031 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Excerpts] The build-up of U.S. naval strength in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf has greatly aggravated the situation in the world. Alongside the United States, Britain is also responsible for the persisting tension in the region. Now a commentary by our military observer Aleksandr Vasilyev:

It has become almost a tradition in recent years for Britain to help the United States carry out military actions in the areas outside the zone of NATO's responsibility, including the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Caribbean region, and other parts of the world. True, so far this assistance has been mainly in the form of London's political approval of Washington's military actions. [passage omitted]

There is every indication that the Tory leaders feel like sharing part of America's military efforts otherwise what can explain the fact that British Armed Forces are conducting the biggest ever exercise in Oman turned by the United States into its military domain. After the exercise, a team of British naval vessels is to remain in the Persian Gulf which is in the focus of enhanced U.S. attention. Another team of British ships is on its way to the Caribbean regin to take part in a 3-month-long joint American-British exercise in this explosive part of the world. Following American vessels, British ships are being deployed in the eastern Mediterranean and American F-111 fighter-bombers, after taking off from Britain, will use British air bases on Cyprus as springboards. Aren's there too many coincidences fraught with adverse consequences for Britain?

On the pretext of releasing the hostages captured in Beirut and protecting the lives of American citizens the United States plans a new invasion in Lebanon, this time with more vigorous involvement of Britain. However, neither the demonstration of strength nor armed interference have ever helped to settle the Middle East problem comprehensively and fairly. They'll prove futile now when the British ruling circles are vigorously assisting the United States in building up tension.

LE FIGARO SUPPORT FOR U.S. PACIFIC ROLE CENSURED

PM061421 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Yu. Kovalenko Paris dispatch: "LE FIGARO's Target -- the Pacific"]

[Text] The visit to the United States by G. Flosse, French secretary of state to the minister of overseas departments and territories in charge of South Pacific issues, where he held talks with U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and G. Sigur, his assistant responsible for the Pacific region, has given the newspaper LE FIGARO reason to launch once again into discussions on "common French-U.S. interests."

On this occasion, Pierre Darcourt, the newspaper's military and political correspondent, has revealed a new area where these interests coincide -- the South Pacific. LE FIGARO reports that strategic and political problems connected with the Soviet military presence in this region were discussed at the French-U.S. meeting. In the last 10 years, the newspaper alleges, the Russians supposedly have been building up their military might in the region and attempting to cross the lines of the 7th U.S. Fleet toward French overseas territory in Polynesia. It transpires that the cunning "Red Odysseuses" are using "trawlers more numerous than the fish in the ocean" for their voyages. According to LE FIGARO, concerned by Soviet "penetration," the commander of U.S naval forces in the Pacific has now declared its southern region a "zone under threat."

The perspicacious Monsieur Darcourt has espied the steel hulls of Soviet warships, Russian aircraft, and missiles through the palisade of trawler masts. In the opinion of LE FIGARO, the situation in the region would be a total disaster if it were not for the armada of the 7th Fleet plowing the waters from Japanese to Philippine shores. With obvious respect for strength, the newspaper enumerates the arsenals of the 7th Fleet: 6 aircraft carriers, 30 nuclear submarines, 400 aircraft, 140 ships, and so forth. This "safety barrier" is protecting French overseas territory -- New Caledonia and Polynesia, including Mururoa atoll, where Paris carries out its nuclear tests.

Several factors are a cause of particular concern to the LE FIGARO correspondent: First of all, M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok on 28 July 1986, in which he proposed holding a Helsinki-style Pacific conference and spoke in favor of "including the Asian and Pacific region in the general process of creating a comprehensive internatinal security system." An important step in this direction is the fact that the Soviet Union has signed a treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific which was drawn up by states in the region.

While the Soviet Union is in favor of beginning talks on reducing activity in the Pacific by military fleets, primarily ships equipped with nuclear weapons, and is proposing a discussion of measures to build confidence and ensure the nonuse of force in the region, LE FIGARO -- the mouthpiece of pro-Atlantic circles -- is once again calling for solidarity with Washington. It basically is proposing that the United States be responsible for protecting French overseas territory -- on which, incidentally, no one is encroaching -- and trying to give French-U.S. cooperation an anti-Soviet slant.

UK DEFENSE MINISTRY MOVIE BRANDED 'ANTI-SOVIET'

PM061233 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Falsehood on Film"]

[Text] London, 5 Feb -- "Preserving Peace" is the pretentious title of an anti-Soviet movie produced on instructions from the British Defense Ministry. Everything said in the movie about the USSR has the aim of instilling in the British people the idea of a "growing Soviet military threat" and the intention of this "communist country and its Communist Party" to pursue an "expansionist policy" after World War II and "attack Western Europe."

In order to present greater cogency, these "fears" experienced by NATO and the British Government are backed up by statements from the officers of British troops stationed in the FRG. According to them, the West expects and "attack" from the USSR and, moreover, Moscow's advantage lies in the fact that it supposedly will "determine the time and place of the attack."

This idea also is conveyed by Lord Carrington, NATO general secretary, during his appearance in the movie.

It is no secret that this movie is needed by those who initiated it to justify the presence of U.S. nuclear cruise missiles in the British Isles and to give theoretical foundation to plans to reequip the British submarine fleet with the latest Trident nuclear missile system. The real, ill-concealed purpose of this movie is to intensify mistrust of the Soviet Union and whip up the atmosphere of anti-Sovietism.

AUSTRIAN FILM ON PRISONERS 'ANTI-SOVIET LAMPOON'

PM100935 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent N. Novikov "Rejoinder": "Fabrication Shown on Television"]

[Text] Vienna -- A few days ago the first channel of Austrian Radio and Television carried a crude anti-Soviet lampoon.

At "peak" time, immediately after the "Zeit im Bild" news bulletin, television viewers were offered a film "about human rights and the situation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union" produced by British "experts." The commentary was provided by Austrian television observer H. Benedikt together with renegades who deserted their motherland and are earning their 30 pieces of silver in this way.

Barbed wire, shorn heads, rows of buildings, and watchtowers crossed the screen. The authors and the commentators were trying to convince viewers that these were "Soviet camps where dissidents" rather than common criminals "were languishing."

Such clumsy anti-Soviet concoctions are presented to television viewers while the Vienna meeting, called upon to improve the political climate on the European continent, strengthen trust between people, and consolidate peace and security, is under way in the Austrian capital. By showing this fabrication Austrian television has demonstrated that it is dancing to someone else's tune.

CPSU GREETS LUXEMBOURG CP LEADER, BESTOWS ORDER

Birthday Greetings

PM091134 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 87 First Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee message to Rene Urbany]

[Text] To Comrade Rene Urbany, chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg.

Dear Comrade Urbany!

On your 60th birthday, we send you cordial congratulations on behalf of all Soviet Communists. You enjoy great sympathy and respect in our country as leader of the militant Communist party of Luxembourg and as a committed internationalist who invariably advocates friendship with the CPSU and the Soviet Union and the development of all-around relations between our countries and peoples.

We wish you great successes in your tireless activity for the sake of the working people of Luxembourg and in the name of the triumph of the ideas of peace, democracy, and social progress.

The CPSU Central Committee

October Revolution Order

PM091136 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 87 First Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on the Award of the Order of the October Revolution to Comrade Rene Urbany, Chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] For services in the struggle for the cause of peace, democracy, and social progress, for his contribution to strengthening friendship between the Soviet and Luxembourg peoples, and in connection with his 60th birthday, Comrade Rene Urbany, chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, is awarded the Order of the October Revolution.

A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Moscow, Kremlin, 6 February 1987

TURKEY'S ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALISM, DANGER TO UNITY

LD072302 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Stanislav Starasov commentary]

[Text] One of the topics that attracts attention is the growth of Islamic fundamentalism in Turkey. The Turkish press has recently been commenting with concern on the demands of various sects in the country and on the dangers that will face national unity if their influence increases.

President Kenan Evren has also commented on this issue. Who is the instigator of Islamic fundamentalism in Turkey? This is what our commentator Stanislav Starasov writes on this subject.

There was a highly interesting article in the 20 January 1987 issue of the West German FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG on the activities of Islamic fundamentalists in Turkey. The same paper also wrote that someone called Cemalettin Kaplan, who now lives in the FRG, is the leader of this movement. Cassettes containing sermons by him are currently in circulation in Turkey. FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG has also stated that the fundamentalists also may stage a rebellion in Turkey. Turkish papers reported a while ago that the Islamic fundamentalists staged a demonstration in Konya; they were demanding that the Turkish Constitution be brought in line with the provisions of Shari'a, or Islamic law. They have also staged demonstrations in other towns as well.

Our commentator Stanislav Starasov continues his comment: The voice of Tehran Radio has mingled with the voice of the Turkish fundamentalists. Now to beg the question: could it not be that all these developments are coordinated -- and who may be directing them? In this regard I am reminded of the events of the 1960's and 1970's. These decades are known as the period of anarchy and terrorism in Turkey. It was later found out that the U.S. intelligence service, the CIA, had a hand in the events of that period. (Richard Auburn), an American specialist in subversive activities, related that the CIA had long practiced infiltrating its own people into the ranks of the fanatical religious organizations. These agents were activated during periods when, in the CIA's views, Turkey began following an independent policy to bring into play tested methods, such as introducing ethnic and religious splits within the population. It thus can not be ruled out that Cemalettin Kaplan, for instance, has contacts with the CIA -- particularly as the activities of this secret U.S. intelligence organization among right-wing Turkish politicians in the FRG are well known.

Our commentator Stanislav Starasov concludes his commentary as follows: The least that can be said is that the growth of Islamic fundamentalism in Turkey cannot be regarded as accidental. Its activities bear an amazing similarity to those of the CIA aimed at upsetting the sociopolitical stability in Turkey in the 1970's.

BRIEFS

DANISH AGRO-INDUSTRIAL SEMINAR -- Tallinn January 30 TASS -- Danish agribusiness firms today completed a series of seminars in Tallinn, capital ofthe Soviet Baltic Republic of Estonia. The expert meetings, which attracted much specialist interest in Estonia, followed similar seminars in the Belorussian capital of Minsk and the Latvian capital of Riga. All those events, a TASS correspondent was told by Lars Ravnsbek, a commercial counsellor of Denmark's Council on Industry, had been useful as they had provided a further impulse to developing Soviet-Danish cooperation in agriculture and associated industries. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 30 Jan 87 LD]

OUTGOING BELGIAN AMBASSADOR -- Moscow February 2 TASS -- Anatoliy Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister, has received today and talked with Rene Panis, Belgium's ambassador to the Soviet Union, in connection with the latter's departure for home. A luncheon has been given in honour of the Belgian ambassador. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 2 Feb 87 LD]

REPORTAGE ON KOMPLEKTOV'S LATIN AMERICAN TOUR

Sees Brazil's Foreign Minister

PM051241 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS "Official Report"]

[Text] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.G. Komplektov had a conversation on 3 February in Brasilia with Brazilian Foreign Minister Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre. During the conversation, they discussed in broad, general terms matters pertaining to relations between the USSR and Brazil. Both sides expressed an intention to develop them further.

The meeting took place in a businesslike, friendly atmosphere. On the same day, V.G. Komplektov had consultations with the leadership of the country's Foreign Ministry.

Meets Uruguayan President

PM091229 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In a Spirit of Good Will"]

[Text] Montevideo, 7 Feb -- Uruguayan President Julio Maria Sanguinetti has received USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.G. Komplektov, who is on a visit here. There was a conversation, which took place in a spirit of good will, on the questions of mutual interest to both countries. Mutual interest in and readiness for the further advance of Soviet-Uruguayan relations was expressed.

V.G. Komplektov was received by Jorge Sanguinetti, Uruguayan minister of transportation and public works. On the same day, meetings took place with Senator Americo Ricaldoni, chairman of the Uruguayan parliament standing commission, and Roberto Asiain, chairman of the chamber of deputies foreign affairs commission.

Foreign Ministry Consultations

PM100917 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister, who is in Montevideo, has held political consultations at the Uruguayan Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A talk with Enrique Iglesias, the Uruguayan minister of foreign affairs was held. During the exchange of views, it was confirmed that the two countries' positions on the main international problems are close or coincide. Both sides also expressed their intention to promote the advancement of bilateral relations which are developing favorably on the whole.

Future Gorbachev Visit

PA071913 Havana International Service in Spanish 1600 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Text] After meeting in Montevideo with Uruguayan President Jose Maria Sanguinetti, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov advocated a peaceful solution of world conflicts. In statements to the press in Uruguay, Komplektov said that he and Sanguinetti discussed trade relations between the USSR and Uruguay and ways to increase these relations through new mechanisms. They also discussed various aspects of the current international situation.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister praised the effort and political willingness of Contadora and its Support Group in the search for peace in Central America. He confirmed that top USSR leader Mikhail Gorbachev will visit Uruguay on an as yet undisclosed date, and added that President Sanguinetti had accepted an invitation to visit Moscow. The Soviet official ends his official 3-day visit to Uruguay today.

Additional Coverage

For additional reportage on the visit of Deputy Foreign Minister Komplektov to various Latin American countries, see the Brazil section of the 4 February Latin America DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

EEC, C. AMERICA STATES CONSIDER REGIONAL CRISIS

LD091448 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Guatemala February 9 TASS -- TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Trushin reports:

Foreign ministers of 21 member states of the West European Common Market, of Central America and the Contadora Group meet at a conference here today.

The EEC's representatives who arrived at the conference state their support of the Contadora process aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement of the Central American crisis on the basis of the principles of non-interference, respect for the rights of the peoples in the region to self-determination and an independent way of socio-political development.

Leo Tindemans, minister of external relations and chairman of the EEC Council of Ministers, told journalists, in part, that West European countries saw in the Contadora Group an effective instrument for preventing military confrontation in the region.

In supporting the principles of the Contadora Group, he said, the EEC plans to give economic aid to Central America on a just basis, without discriminating against any country.

Venezuela's Foreign Minister Simon Alberto Consalvi stated that the presence at the Guatemalan forum of the delegations from 12 West European countries reflected the world community's deep anxiety over the sharpening of the Central American conflict. He said that the region's political problems were inseparable from the economic ones.

The United States made attempts to downgrade with the help of its allies the political importance of the Guatemalan conference. It has been learnt here that already at the preparatory stage of the conference the representatives of the so-called Tegucigalpa Group, uniting El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, opposed a draft of the final political document proposed by the EEC, which expressed decisive support of the Contadora process.

Simultaneously, the Reagan administration augmented its political manoeuvres with the military ones. In the runup to the conference in Guatemala, the Pentagon began to conduct new joint U.S.-Honduran manoeuvres in three areas of Honduras at once.

TASS INTERVIEWS HAITIAN CP LEADERS ON PROTESTS

LD061802 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Havana February 6 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov reports:

Rene Theodore, general secretary of the Central Committee of the United Party of Haitian Communists (UPHC), said that mass demonstrations were planned on Haiti at the call of the UPHC on February 7, the first anniversary of the downfall of the Duvalier dictatorship. Protestors will demand an immediate resignation of the puppet triumvirate headed by General Namphy.

Rene Theodore told TASS in a telephone interview from Port-au-Prince that Namphy's order on arrests without charges was aimed at intimidating democratic forces and all the population on the eve of mass popular actions. In other words, the communist leader noted, all progressive forces fighting for true democracy and progress on Haiti were threatened with brutal reprisals.

Launching reprisals against people, the regime is seeking to prevent a growth in protests against its anti-popular and pro-American policy.

The Haitian communist leader pointed out that nothing had changed to the better in the country in a year's rule of the U.S. henchman. Moreover, U.S. crude interference in Haitian domestic affairs has drastically increased. This manifests itself, among other things, in fact that denationalization of a small number of state-owned enterprises, still operating in the country, is being carried out at the bidding of the White House. Rene Theodore pointed out that the interference had caused a disastrous aggravation of the economic crisis on Haiti last year.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS PRESIDIUM MEETS 9 FEBRUARY

LD100002 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Today, the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers, at a meeting of leaders of USSR ministries and departments, and representatives of the Union Republic Councils of Ministers, considered the question of immediate measures to fulfil the decisions of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum on restructuring and the party's cadre policy, on the tasks and directives contained in the report of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and adopted them to be subject to undeviating guidance and execution.

Permanent bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries, departments and the Union Republic Councils of Ministers are requested to commence practical work toward accelerating restructuring, particularly in the area of efficiency and quality, scientific and technological progrss and in the social sphere.

The ministries, departments, the Union Republic Councils of Ministers and all managerial personnel have been given the task of rapidly assimilating the economic methods of management based on complete financial autonomy and on self-financing, broad independence and enhanced responsibility of managers and labor collectives for the final results of the work of enterprises and associations.

The question of organizing a detailed and all-round study and discussion of the draft USSR law on the state enterprise-association, approved by the CPSU Central Committee plenum, was examined in detail during the session. The session has drawn up measures to further strengthen the socialist rule of law in economic activities, to intensify the legal education of managerial personnel and all working people, and to put in order the existing practice of checks at enterprises, associations, and organizations, so that they do not become formal but an aid to the business in hand.

The Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers demands that USSR ministries, departments and the Union Republic councils of ministers concentrate their efforts on the unconditional fulfilment of the 1987 plan and take the essential measures, so that not only is the February plan fulfilled but also that the shortfalls in the set tasks permitted in January in a number of industries should be made good. Everything must be done so that the socialist pledges adopted by workers' collectives for the 2d year of the 5-year plan should be fulfilled on the basis of a radical change in working and highly-productive labor on the part of each team, section, and workshop, of each enterprise and association, collective and state farm, and that the 70th anniversary of Great October should be given a worthy welcome.

Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, spoke at the Presidium session.

PROKHOROV DISCUSSES REFORMING ELECTORAL SYSTEM

LD061143 Moscow TASS in English 0913 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 6 TASS -- By TASS commentator Boris Prokhorov.

Democratization of the Soviet election system will be part of the broader reorganization effort currently under way in all spheres of life in the USSR.

Related proposals are now being discussed both in the press and at public meetings.

Before the proposed changes become a legal norm, they must go through procedures established by Soviet legislation, which include not only the drafting and enactment process in parliament but also nationwide discussion of the corresponding draft law.

One of the proposals mentioned at a recent plenum of the party's Central Committee is for larger electoral districts and multicandidate slates.

How can this help democratize our election system?

The idea, basically, is to give a possibility to as many voters as possible to express their opinion on each candidate.

In practice, this will be as follows: Several electoral districts in their current bounds will be merged to form one larger district from which several candidates will be elected (currently, there is one candidate standing for election from each district).

So a voter on polling day will be given a multicandidate ballot and express his opinion on three, four or five candidates rather than one candidate as at present.

In other words, the voter will be able to say his say on more candidates than today.

The suggested ideas for improving the Soviet election system are not limited to this proposal for larger electoral districts.

There have been also quite a few other suggestions for making voter participation both in the campaigns and in the elections more active and efficient and the process of forming elected bodies of popular power more democratic.

All wishes that either have already been expressed and will have been voiced will be carefully considered as the Soviet election system is upgraded.

It would be wrong to think that it has been decided in the USSR simply to replace an outmoded election system with a new one.

The Soviet election system, which has existed in its present form for more than a half a century from 1936, has quite a few valuable elements that have passed the test of time and will be preserved.

The changes that will be made to the system will be aimed at making it still better.

MEDVEDEV ASSESSES GORBACHEV'S REFORM INITIATIVES

PM281222 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 25-26 Jan 86 p 5 (AVANTI! DELLA DOMENICA supplement)

[Interview with Soviet historian Roy Medvedev by Guiseppe Pagano in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] [Pagano] What do you think of the new Soviet course and that of the CPSU general secretary in particular?

[Medvedev] I believe that Gorbachev is the best leader of all the possible candidates close to power 2 years ago. Perhaps in the next generation there will be more capable leaders, but in the present group close to power Gorbachev was undoubtedly the best. All the other alternatives were worse.

Gorbachev has revealed a capacity for quick decisions and has considerably broadened his personal outlook and his influence recently. He has made decisions that would not have been expected 2 years ago. The Gorbachev of Reykjavik, for instance, is sharply distinct from the Gorbachev of Geneva. The present Gorbachev, who concerns himself with ideological and topical issues, is very frankly distinct from and much better than the Gorbachev of last year or 3 years ago, and it is apparent that he has not fully exploited his political potential.

Therefore, if we were to follow the Western method of opinion polls, it would emerge that Gorbachev's popularity rating within the intelligentsia has increased considerably in recent months. But from the workers' viewpoint, for instance, there are undoubtedly factors that do not help his popularity. For instance, the struggles for discipline or against alcohol are hard to endure after 20 years of slackness.

[Pagano] What about the post-Reykjavik situation?

[Medvedev] I would say that virtually nothing has changed since Reykjavik. Relations with America have deteriorated and the USSR's policy toward the United States has become more resolute. Clearly the Soviet leadership wants to make a favorable impact on public opinion in the Western countries — especially in Germany, Britain, and the United States — and in general it is hoping for future interlocutors better disposed toward its proposals.

[Pagano] What is your opinion as a historian regarding the Irangate affair...?

[Medvedev] I believe that the Soviet Government is rather pleased about Irangate. Irangate is a very complex affair. What part is played by the Democratic Party's desire to create trouble for Reagan? On the other hand, the Irangate affairs is fairly normal for organizations such as the CIA or the National Security Council.

The affair does not have, and has not had, a major impact on the Soviets. Indeed, there are many more numerous and much more serious matters in our own country, which is why there are no very fierce newspaper articles about Irangate. Under Brezhnev there were hundreds of similar cases. If we were to examine everything that has happened.... In any case we cannot. We do not have a multiparty system; we do not have independent courts and agencies; no such organizations have yet been created. I repeat: In my opinion the Soviet Government is pleased about Irangate because it is an affair that has implicated Reagan.

[Pagano] The Soviet Government intends to grant a guiding role to the market in order to surmount the serious economic crisis assailing the country and to maintain links with the international economy. Do you believe this trend could have positive results?

[Medvedev] Of course I consider such a phenomenon a very good thing. The market economy must develop in our country within certain limits, and its extension is envisaged because, following the individual labor law, another law envisaging a broader use of the market, is being prepared on cooperatives and state concerns. It is the only path that can be followed. There are no alternatives to the expansion of the market. However, Gorbachev and his aides are encountering very strong resistance.

Recently the director general of a group of major concerns said: "We have had some very good decisions from the Central Committee, whereby we will be much more independent." But all this has been stated in the newspapers. They are general decisions. We receive from our ministry instructions on how these decisions are to be implemented, and it emerges that our new rights do not exist in practice. For instance, we want to use the millions of rubles' profit with which we are left within the enterprise, but the Finance Ministry tells us: Dear friends, all this has already been transferred to the main plan and has been allocated to other purposes. A recent example was provided by Health Minister Pilikov, [name and title as published], who decided to raise the incomes of particular categories of medical staff -- doctors, gynecologists, surgeons, nurses, and so forth. Although the decision was approved and became binding as of 1 November, no wage increases materialized. Only now, following protests, have the figures been reexamined and increases been made in the incomes of these categories of medical personnel since 1 November.

There is a joke about this. A peasant is asked: What do you think of Gorbachev's policy? The peasant replies: It is like the taiga, with a great rustling, a lot of noise, at the top, but everything calm at the bottom.

I would say that the most important thing is not so much the bottom but the intermediate band.

[Pagano] Another point that has distinguished Gorbachev's action for reform is the release of a number of political prisoners, which it is believed could be extended to the other prisoners in the gulag.

[Medvedev] It is not at all like Chile here. There are not many political prisoners, and furthermore they are split into various groups. Personally, I believe that dissidents' release will always be an individual matter. There will not be a general amnesty, partly because 60-70 percent of political prisoners are sentenced under the penal code -- cunningly used, of course. One well-known Ukrainian journalist was arrested and released several times and eventually arrested on a charge of attempted rape. In a letter he begs people not to believe the charge, which he condemns as a provocation. And it is possible.

[Pagano] With regard to the problem of the Jews, many of them persistently seek permission to leave the country, but without success.

[Medvedev] I believe it is a complex and delicate problem. Our propaganda states that the Jews would be badly off in the West and in fact emphasis is placed on the cases of Jewish families returning from the United States. Be that as it may, I believe that many Jews will continue trying to emigrate.

[Pagano] Do you believe there could be an evolution of American foreign policy and of the Americans with respect to the USSR?

[Medvedev] American foreign policy will remain unchanged as long as Reagan remains. The American public's attitude could change and cause problems for the President. If Gorbachev had released Sakharov 2 weeks before the Reykjavik meeting Reagan's position would have been much more difficult. In Reagan's and the conservative forces' eyes, a democratized USSR is much worse than a totalitarian USSR. It is no coincidence that a representatie of the American Right has said that he would prefer a Chernenko-type person rather than a Gorbachev as leader of the Soviet Union.

[Pagano] How is the new respect for human rights that is spreading reconciled with the drastic measures against corruption, which extend as far as the death sentence? Do you not perceive a major contradiction in this?

[Medvedev] I believe so. I do not believe it is possible to abolish the death sentence in the USSR but I do believe it should be abolished for so-called political crimes. In the case of murderers there is always talk of reeducation camps, and the entire system is based in theory on the idea that convicts must be reeducated. Be that as it may, when someone such as Sokolov, director of Food Store No 1, is executed, people are convinced that the main guilty party of this system of corruption has been punished. Many party and government leaders who encouraged, covered up, and participated personally in this system have simply been retired, whereas the actual operators have been executed.

[Pagano] You have said that there could be a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan this year. Whence do you derive this optimism?

[Medvedev] I can only hope that it will happen, but the situation in Afghanistan is so complex and tangled that it will take time to extricate ourselves from it once and for all. I am confident, but in the longer term, and it will certainly be a gradual process.

[Pagano] Young people in the West are highly organized and committed in support of peace. Is it not conceivable that Soviet youth could do the same, autonomously and independently?

[Medvedev] I do not see much chance of it for the present. Everything is dependent on the Komsomol and official organizations. According to Soviet ideology, there cannot be any bodies autonomous from the Communist Party. I would very much like for this to happen. It would be the most important step toward the country's democratization and could open the way to not only independent but even opposition organizations. Our government is still a long way from considering anything of this kind.

[Pagano] What do you think of the present Italian Government?

[Medvedev] Craxi has proved to be the most efficient Italian government leader of the past 30 years.

AMBARTSUMOV ON DEMOCRATIZATION, HUMAN RIGHTS

PM091459 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 6, 8 Feb p 3

["Political Diary" article by Yevgeniy Ambartsumov: "The Right To Be"]

[Text] In insisting that democratic institutions should have a more tangible effect on public life, the January Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee implied that in the past these institutions were largely formal and decorative as nuts on a Christmas tree.

We all knew this from daily experience. People were increasingly aware that their opinions did not matter much because the democratic institutions at their jobs from trade union meetings to production meetings were usually viewed both by the management and staff as a boring obligatory formality. [paragraph continues]

A noted collective-farm chairman bitterly recalls in PRAVDA the tyranny of higher authorities as regards collective-farm democracy, the declared rights of collective-farm members to independently manage their own affairs. A law professor admits of a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA journalist that seeing a militiaman he crosses to the other side of the street obviously fearing that the law enforcement officer may abuse his powers as has too frequently happened until recently. Elections to government bodies were becoming irrelevant because of the absence of choice. The vague concept of a law-abiding society was being eroded together with one's concepts of law. People believed rather than actually were citizens. Was it for this reason that the very word "citizen" came to be thought of by masses of people as a semi-irony associated exclusively with bureaucratic procedures and standing in queues?

This country has every right to be proud of the socio-economic rights won by the Revolution. But in recent years the right to work has been increasingly divorced from the duty to work honestly and has been deteriorating into the right to live off the state, to money-grubbing, to chasing status-symbol property. The poverty of social being was offset by the right to steal from the state, by the right to receive and posses even if through unlawful means. In short, the real rights and opportunities were out of joint with the declared legal rights.

Practised tricksters were the winners while honest "beavers" and society as a whole were the losers.

The top people in society would seem to have all the rights but those rights remained also imagined in many respects because their managerial omnipotence - an, illusory one! - produced results quite opposite to those expected: stagnation instead of growth, disintegration of society instead of consolidation.

The natural opposition of healthy, genuinely socialist forces which have now gained a worthy and purposeful leadership has revived society. We are regaining our rights in their reassuring and compelling completeness, as well as our civic and human dignity. The working people are now getting not only the right to choose their leaders but also the sense of responsibility for their factory or office. Citizens are getting the real right to choose their representatives in the bodies of state power, the right to control all aspects of public life.

Today we can boldly challenge the developed West for a competition in the field of human rights. Because today we have got the genuinely human right trampled upon under the capitalist system not only to seem to be, not only to have, but to be. To be modern people in whole variety of social pursuits. To be citizens in the lofty sense of this word.

ACADEMICIAN VIEWS RESTRUCTURING, SOCIOLOGY

PM061614 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 87 First Edition pp 2-3

[Academician T. Zaslavskaya article under the rubric "Questions of Theory": "Restructuring and Sociology"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum once again showed convincingly that the party is doing truly titanic work to eliminate the various "obstructions" which have accumulated in the path of our society's development. The habit of half-truths, which in a certain sense are worse than lies, is being persistently overcome. We are, so to speak, learning anew to look truth in the face, and that fact alone is perhaps worth all the others.

Not only is the entire system of social relations undergoing restructuring, but the struggle "for" and "against" that restructuring is becoming tremendously intense. And this, it seems to me, is the clearest evidence of all of the revolutionary nature of the current transformations.

The process of active renewal of society, which is taking place before our very eyes, greatly changes the demands on the social sciences.

"Restructuring," M.S. Gorbachev has noted, "means a decisive turn toward science, a businesslike partnership between it and practice with a view to achieving the highest end results, the ability to place any initiative on a firm scientific footing, and the willingness and ardent desire on the part of scientists actively to support the party's course of renewing society..."

Let us be frank: For a long time social science was not in the vanguard of society, but more in its wake. In essence it trailed along behind practice, confining itself largely to reiterating, explaining, and approving party decisions that had aleady been adopted. This is now impossible. Science must study and clarify not only the paths already trodden, but the stretches still to come, and must warn society in good time about the difficulties which await it, work out alternative solutions, and substantiate the choice of the best. Scientific activity oriented in this way not only could be, but is already becoming an active motive force and a very important instrument of the restructuring.

This article examines, by way of discussion, those problems of sociology that are, in the author's view, the most pressing.

Every decision adopted, every new step of the restructuring touches on social interests, changes the situation, and transforms the behavior of many interacting groups. In these conditions the management organs greatly need full, accurate, and truthful information about the real state of affairs in any area of social life and the requirements, interests, values, and behavior of social groups in a particular situation, as well as the possible influence of their behavior on social processes. It is the duty of sociology to provide the practical area with this information.

Sociology must also play a considerable role in concretizing the party's course of acceleration of economic development. Although the general direction of the restructuring of economic management was specified by the congress, its practical implementation requires many thousands of decisions on a more concrete level (for instance, an answer to questions such as precisely which administrative components are superfluous; what types of individual labor activity merit support and development, and which should be stopped; what differentiation in remuneration for work of different kinds is considered just and what is excessive, and so forth).

And every such decision requires sociological interpretation and substantiation. It is necessary to define as accurately as possible the most important interacting groups in the economy, and to study the concrete conditions of their activity, the relationship between rights and duties, the content and means of realizing interests, and the methods of coordinating group interests with public interests.

An equally important task for sociology is to provide the management of restructuring with reliable "feedback." After all, the adoption of the most correct and necessary decision by the top management organs is not the last step, but rather the first step in transforming reality. Such a decision will subsequently "accumulate" a large number of concrete instructions, be interpreted by departments and local organs, and only then change real relations on the spot, making them more efficient or, conversely, making something worse and causing unforeseen consequences. This makes it necessary to ensure constant sociological monitoring of the course of fulfillment of decisions and the development of concrete restructuring processes.

Another very important function of sociology, the formation of social thinking in people, must not be forgotten. The activation of the human factor and the eradication of the social apathy established in the preceding period -- that is the decisive condition for the success of the party's transformational activity. We all know what scientific forces and resources have in the past been used in the quest for means of liberating and peacefully utilizing atomic energy. But liberating the masses' social energy and channeling it into the direction society needs is an equally large-scale and probably equally complex task. And it belongs first and foremost to the sociologists.

Clearly the restructuring makes great, multifaceted demands on sociology. Is it ready to fulfill them?

In the last 25 years sociology in the USSR has achieved some successes. Its status as an independent science has become more or less established. The Soviet Sociological Association unites more than 8,000 individual members and 1,500 collective members, while the total number of sociologists in the country is 15,000-20,000.

Apart from the specialized Sociological Research Institute, within the system of the academies of sciences of the USSR and the union republics there are more than 40 sociology departments. Active research collectives in the areas of sociology have been formed in many VUZ social science faculties.

A trend has emerged for an increased practical return on the research done. An ever greater role is played in information backup for management activity by public institutes (councils, commissions) of sociological research under party raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms and republican party committees. Applied sociological services in industry and other sectors of the national economy are estimated to number 3,000-4,000 people.

Major scientific collectives have been formed and are operating successfully both in the field of "pure" sociology and in socioeconomic, sociodemographic, and sociological areas, and they are characterized by a high level of professionalism and obtain important results.

The first steps are being taken to set up higher sociological education in the country. Every year 5-8 doctoral and 25 candidates' dissertations are defended in the speciality of "applied sociology." The number of sociological publications is increasing.

On the whole Soviet sociology has considerable potential. But the pace of its development in the last 10-15 years has been excessively slow. As a result our sociology is far more weakly developed than, say, in Poland or Hungary, not to mention the developed capitalist countries. Our country publishes one "pure" sociology journal, while in the United States the sociological association alone publishes eight such journals, of which there are several dozen in all. Whereas the first 100 professional sociologists with higher education in our country will graduate in 1989, in the United States 260 sociology faculties annually produce 6,000 specialists, while some 90,000 Americans master the basics of sociological studes.

In the recent past this laggardness did not worry many people. Moreover sociologists, who are always finding problems, caused more annoyance than approval in some management workers. But the situation has changed. In the conditions of restructuring poorly developed sociology becomes a brake on social development.

In order actively to promote the acceleration, sociology itself must first engage in a rapid restructuring both quantitatively and — especially — qualitatively. But how is this to be achieved? In order to answer this question it is obviously necessary to study the causes of the existing situation, assess our own activity self-critically, and determine our share of responsibility for the fact that the state of sociology in the USSR is not up to the tasks facing it.

First of all it must be admitted that the professional standard of much sociological research is still low. A purely descriptive approach, the simplistic treatment of questions, the low level of representativeness of data, and the mass production of social development plans and reports on the basis of a single stereotype are unfortunately encountered all too often. If sociological research is to become an effective instrument of transformation, it must become considerably more profound and be linked to fundamental theory, and the creative quest must be stepped up. An important step in this direction is the transition which has begun in a number of sociological collectives from the traditional describing of the structure and dynamics of the objects of study to the uncovering of the social mechanisms of their reproduction. This will, I believe, enable us to increase the effectiveness and practicability of recommendations to management organs.

We have also put too little effort into creating a fundamental sociological theory.

Finally, we must admit that we have not displayed the desire or ability to unite to tackle major problems. Hostility and squabbles between groups of sociologists, petty struggles over self-esteem, and the inability to understand or acknowledge each other have led to the disintegration of a whole series of promising sociological collectives. On top of this there was a specific cadre policy as a result of which the best known and most highly qualified sociologists were forced to leave the Sociological Research Institute, and recently also the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Socioeconomic Problems, and join nonsociological institutes, and are now working virtually in isolation "on the periphery" of sociology. The result of this policy was the virtual disappearance of the once renowned Leningrad school of sociology and a serious weakening of the personnel of the Sociological Research Institute, which prevents that institute from successfully fulfilling the functions of an all-union theoretical and methodological center of sociological research that it was in principle supposed to carry out.

The debate on the subject of Marxist-Leninist sociology has lasted for nearly 2 decades. Sociology's status as an independent science is not recognized fully or by everyone.

It is today extremely important to change the attitude to sociology as a "second-rate" science which we do not yet know whether to develop, and to establish its equal status with the other social sciences.

The cadre situation in our area is also complex. It is best reflected in the cutting formula "sociology without sociologists." Even our leading sociologists are, strictly speaking, self-taught. True, the older generation of scientists, who have been working for 25 years now, have accumulated much knowledge and could successfully hand it down to subsequent generations. But there is no system that is at all well developed for passing on sociological knowledge This usually takes place either within sociological collectives or through the system of postgraduate studies and apprenticeship. In either case what is produced is a "solitary specimen," and all these years there has been no mass education of sociologists in the USSR, nor its there today. The departments of applied sociology which opened in 1984 at Moscow State University and Leningrad State University are, firstly, small, and, secondly, are poor at attracting professional sociologists to teach there. The quality of the cadres trained by this means naturally arouses doubt. The "vacuum" in sociology cadres is filled by nonspecialists, which lowers the standard of sociological research and compromises the science.

In order to overcome this abnormal situation, which is largely determined by the stance of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, an integrated program for the development of sociological education must be drawn up, approved, and implemented.

The research done by scientific collectives to test specific theoretical hypotheses is only the tip of the iceberg in terms of information about social processes. The base consists of the system of state social statistics, designed to systematically study and record the course of demographic, economic, and social processes.

Of the socialist states, Hungary probably has the most developed system of social statistics. Regular sociological and statistical studies based on nationwide sampling and covering a wide range of problems are supplemented here by nearly 20 "panels" which ensure prolonged monitoring of the fate of particular population groups (for instance, young families, graduates from specific VUZ's, and so forth). On the completion of processing of the data, the statistical bodies pass them over to scientists for use in relation to the topics studied.

There is a different picture in the USSR. Of the developed countries, we have one of the lowest levels of social statistics. Let me stipulate that in my view social statistics is not what is kept in the storerooms of the Central Statistical Administration, but the end result of data processing, published openly in the press and available to a wide range of people. Its development has been curtailed since the second half of the seventies. Thus, for instance, the publication of data from All-Union Population Censuses has become increasingly meager since 1959. More and more sections of social information have been "concealed" from social scientists.

Data are not published on the prevalence of crime, the frequency of suicide, the level of alcohol and drug use, or the ecological situation in various cities and regions, although these phenomena are traditional subjects of statistics in economically developed countries. Data on population migration between regions and between the city and the countryside have disappeared from the press.

And why are data on disease distribution among the population concealed? Why is such meager informtion published on the differentiation of the level and structure of incomes and the population's prosperity? Even if negative trends have appeared in these areas, is it is not more correct to draw the public's attention to them and together discuss ways of tackling the problems? The course of restructuring the system of social relations put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress requires precisely this approach.

For the sake of objectivity it must be observed that in recent years the collection and analysis of social information has been widening systematically. However, scientific organizations receive even fewer data from the USSR Central Statistical Administration than before, since the acquisition of such data is hedged about with large numbers of bureaucratic barriers.

At the same time the availability of social statistical data not only to scientists, but to broad strata of the population is linked in the most direct way to openness in public life. If you conceal from people summarized information about the conditions of their own life (for instance, the degree of environmental pollution, the level of accidents in production, the prevalance of crime, and so forth), you cannot expect them to become more active in either the production or the political sphere. People's trust and support can be obtained only in response to trust placed in them.

Although a large proportion of sociological research is oriented toward "assistance for the practical area," sociologists' real participation in management is not great. Frankly, it is rather difficult to name a single administrative decision affecting the vital interests of many social strata and groups that has been based on a reliable sociological study carried out beforehand. Yet examples of the reverse are not hard to find. Remember, for instance, the unjustfied course of eliminating personal plots in the early sixties; the mass transformation of kolhozes into sovkhozes, which undermined financial autonomy in agriculture; the division of rural settlements into those with and those without a future, which led to the degeneration of the network of settlements in many rural areas; the mass construction in rural localities of multistory apartment blocks whose inhabitants dream of returning to their own houses; the elimination of small rural schools, which speeded up the population exodus to the cities, and so on, and so forth.

State expert consultations on major projects (such as the diversion of part of the flow of the Siberian and northern rivers to southern parts of the country, the opening up of the Baykal-Amur Railroad zone, and so forth) was and is carried out, as a rule, with minimal participation by sociologists. The sociologists' contribution to the design, formulation, monitoring, and summing up of socioeconomic experiments is also small.

The lack of organized "dialogue" between sociology and management practice is harmful to both. It seems to me that this situation must be rectified from both sides at once. On the one hand, sociologists should increase the effectiveness, reliability, and realistic management thrust of their recommendations, so that these recommendations show not only what must be done, but who should do it and how, and also what will be the probable consequences of the recommended social decisions.

On the other hand, management workers should turn to sociology more, since today no serious social problem can be resolved correctly without it.

I spoke above of the great political role of the open discussion of pressing social problems. [paragraph continues]

After all, such problems often combine to form persistent "syndromes" which require profound study of the roots of the relevant phenomena and serious theoretical interpretation and explanation. This last necessarily requires the free, objective discussion of complex, nontraditional questions. This is what the party Central Committee instructs us to do. Both at the congress and since, the impermissibility of allowing any zones or groups to remain "outside criticism" has been pointed out repeatedly. I believe it is equally harmful to allow zones and groups to remain "outside sociological research." At the same time sociological research, which has set truly major and correspondingly difficult goals, has until recently too often come up against the inscription: "No entrance to unauthorized persons."

I have personally encountered restrictions both as regards the subjects of a proposed poll and as regards the content of problems studied. There have been periods when it would be simpler to enumerate the topics which it was permitted to study than those that were not recommended. I will be frank: If such restrictions are preserved it is impossible seriously to expect effective recommendations from science. If there is to be full exactingness, it is necessary not only to permit, but to welcome, stimulate, and request research into the most acute and tricky problems requiring the speediest resolution. The light of sociological research must penetrate the remotest corners of public life, expose the accumulated dust, and stimulate the speediest possible cleaning up of our common home.

The implementation of the proposed measures to activate and speed up the development of sociology will take both time and organizational work. But Soviet sociologists are ready for that.

MORE ON PHONE-IN CONFERENCE ON RAILROADS

LD221848 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1540 GMT 22 Jan 87

[Text] A routine investigation of the state of affairs of the country's railroads and at enterprises of the fuel and energy complex was conducted today via the channels of the telephone hook-up facility of the Railways Ministry.

Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, who was present at the investigation, addressed the participants of this All-Union conference. Here is what he said in part:

[Begin Ligachev recording] A week has passed since our meeting. Of coursae, in such a short time no miracles have occurred, as the saying goes. The situation still remains extremely complicated. That is how we assess the state of affairs of rail transport. However, we also have every reason to say that work on overcoming the difficulties has begun at full strength. Everywhere, party committees, local government and the relevant economic bodies have gone over to really working round the clock.

In short, we have every reason, comrades, to say that the party committees, proceeding on the instructions of the Central Committee, have together with the economic bodies really set about overcoming the delays in transportation, in the branches of the fuel and energy complex and also in metallurgy.

Rightly, the main emphasis is being placed on developing the initiative of our people, the responsibility of leaders, on intensifying the work of party organizations and on giving all-round help to rail transport both by way of labor resources and material resources.

I would like to cite an example of such good work. This was carried out by the party, local government and economic leaders of Chita Oblast. And because Chita Oblast was for a long time lagging behind on many indices it is all the more pleasant to report that very energetic and businesslike work is now being performed there. At the enterprise, jointly with transport workers, schedules have been drafted for making up the delays that have occurred in the dispatch of output, and these schedules are being monitored by the party. All of this has allowed the Trans-Baykal railroad to work stably in the past few days despite severe frosts and blizzards. Take note, comrades, the loading on that railway is now 15 percent above plan and the number of freight cars waiting to be unloaded has been reduced by two thirds.

I could also cite similar examples of energetic, I would say, intelligent, and effective work on many other railroads including the Moscow and Far eastern railroads. In the last 2 days 22 railroads have overfulfilled the 24-hour plan for loading national economic freight. But when we met before there were only two railroads in such a position.

There has been a slight increase in the work of the fuel and energy complex. The shortfall in coal production is 500,000 tonnes. Let me say directly that the oil and gas workers are working well.

I would like to note with especial satisfaction that in the last 10 days the gas industry of Tyumen Oblast increased recovery and supply of gas by 25 million cubic meters a day. This is an extremely good addition to the country's fuel balance, especially now.

A week ago the shortfall at the Rostovugol Association amounted to more than 25,000 tonnes. Today the miners here have not only made up for the shortfall but, as we have been told, are also overfulfilling the plan tasks.

At the same time, the situation as a whole remains very strained. The volumes of freight are increasing. Evidently, this process will intensify. This is obvious from the reports we heard today. So, there must be no relaxation of efforts; under no circumstances must there be any relaxation of efforts. And it is absolutley not to be tolerated -- I would like to stress this especially -- that the real state of affairs is distorted. This is fundamentally wrong. Bureaucratic clamor and bustle must not be allowed to take the place of vital activity. But such facts exist. This is being reported to us from the localities.

In particular, according to the report of the team of the party's Central Committee which is in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, here, as they say, an excessive number of conferences has already been held and masses of decisions made. But things are going badly. First, the quantity of freight cars not unloaded in good time is increasing. Information is reaching us from the oblast about numerous disconnections of the heating in housing because of poor readiness for winter.

Unfortunately, the situation in Chelyabinsk and Sverdlovsk Oblasts is not yet improving.

Let us now take the railroads. Despite individual changes for the better, arrears in the haulage of freight are growing on the railroads. Handing over freight cars remains maybe the biggest bottleneck in the work now of rail transport, This applies primarily to the West Siberian, the south Urals, the Volga, the southern and virgin lands railroads. Many enterprises of the Ministries of Coal Industry, of Ferrous Metallurgy and especially of construction materials industry and also enterprises and organizations of Karaganda, Lipetsk and Yaroslavl Oblasts have still not put in order the unloading of freight cars.

Examples of a careless, impermissible attitude of many industrial and transport enterprises toward the utilization of freight cars that are being encountered, comrades must especially not be tolerated in the present condition. In particular, because of the carelessness of the workers of the Zhdanov metallurgical combine where, as is known, Comrade Gurov is the director, and of the workers of Zhdanov marshalling yard, whose chief is Comrade Sergeyev, freight cars with large remnants of frozen freight, especially ore and gravel, are constantly being dispatched for loading. Or, as they say, another example, a fresh example now, literally of the last few days. This time we are talking of the south-eastern railroad. On 20 January tankers which still contained almost 25 tonnes of fuel oil were dispatched from the railroad. How can one put up with such disgraceful things? Of course one cannot!

According to the available long-term forecasts, comrades, difficult tests still await us in February. Indeed, January is not yet over. So party and local soviet bodies must maintain assistance to the transport workers in the struggle against snowdrifts, in clearing tracks, and in loading and unloading freight cars.

I would like to ask the party and local soviet bodies to hurry up and sort things out, and bring some order to the organization of the overhaul of the freight cars, using local enterprises. In a word, the main thing is to speed up freight car turnover. I want to stress once again that special concern must be shown for people: for providing them with the conditions they need, both for work and for leisure. The entire arsenal of incentives ought to be brought into action; and moreover, this must be done, as they say, publicly, for all to see. As for those who are remiss and, as I would say, unconscientious, their unconscientious attitude toward their work must be made public, criticized and strictly called to account. Only on that basis can we make up the ground we have lost in the shortest possible time. [end recording]

Comrades Aliyev, Dolgikh, Talyzin and Razumovskiy took part in the conference.

DECREE ON 'LIBERATION' OF DISSIDENTS CONFIRMED

AU091440 Paris AFP in English 1434 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, Feb 9 (AFP) -- The liberation, decreed last week by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (parliament), of a number of imprisoned dissidents "basically" affected those held for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation," a parliamentary official said here Monday.

The official, answering questions by telephone, said the decree would not be published. His was the first official confirmation of the decree's existence.

Under Soviet law, persons convicted of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" can incur up to 10 years' imprisonment followed by five years' internal exile.

Nothing is known about either the contents of the decree or the number of dissidents released under the partial amnesty. But Yelena Bonner, wife of dissident physicist Andrey Sakharov, and other dissident sources Monday named 43 persons said to have been freed last week.

(In Vienna, the president of the Soviet Jurists Association, Aleksandr Sukharev, told a press conference that the amnesty covered about 50 persons.

("The decree will certainly be published," said Mr Sukharev, who is also justice minister of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic, capital Moscow.

(Mr Sukharev and a delegation of Soviet jurists are in Vienna in connection with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The delegation will be meeting a similar U.S. delegation in Vienna.)

MORTALITY RATE FALLS DUE TO ANTI-ALCOHOL PROGRAM

LD100917 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS -- The mortality rate among the able-bodied population in the Soviet Union registered a fall in 1986 for the first time over a long period. It dropped by 15 per cent as against 1984, the Central Statistics Board has reported. Women at the age of 18 to 55 and men at the age of 18 to 60 make up the workforce in the USSR.

The slump in the mortality rate is observed both in absolute figures (680,000 people) and in relative ones (432 people per 100,000 able-bodies people (510 per 100,000) died in 1984.

Demographers hold that the current fall in the mortality rate has been the result of the drive to combat addiction to alcohol, which has been launched in the USSR since 1985. Thirty-three per cent less people died of job-related injuries in 1986 as against 1984. Most of these fatalities are usually caused by the use of alcohol.

The death of cardio-vascular diseases whose worsening was also frequently provoked by alcohol has dropped. One hundred and twenty-five able-bodied people per 100,000 died of these diseases (the figure for 1984 was 143). The death of diseases affecting respiratory organs has dropped by approximately one-third.

The mortality rate among people suffering from cancer does not fall. The number of cases involving death of oncological diseases is growing slowly but steadily. Seventy-five people per 100,000 of those able for work died of malignant growths in 1970. The figure for 1980 was 93 and for 1986 -- 95.

Malignant growths are rated third among the causes of death among able-bodied people behind deaths of blood-circulation diseases and in accidents.

DAMAGE, CASUALTIES REPORTED IN GEORGIAN FLOODS

PM091651 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Special correspondent S. Chriikov article: "Put to the Test by Floods: Reporter Returns from an Assignment"]

[Text] By the time I managed to reach Khobi, the rayon center of the Kolkhidskaya depression, the worst was already over. The elements had done their work but more than 6,000 people had been saved.

It was evening. The evacuees had eaten and were settling into their new temporary accommodation (the sports hall, hostels, and hotels) and were trying to find relatives who could have been evacuated to other settlements. Zurab Yerkvaniya, first secretary of Khobskiy Georgian party Raykom, had a most businesslike meeting with your correspondent: He allowed a maximum of 3 minutes for the conversation. The night before he had led the evacuation and dived into the water to save children himself....

That next night promised to be no less troubled. However, the secretary's energy, inner calm, and confidence transmitted themselves to people.

Around midnight Georgian television broadcast a report from the flood regions, including this one. I saw people recognizing their homes, old women wept, and there was anguish on the young people's faces. At the most difficult time people showed their unity. Many of those not directly affected took between 10 and 15 people into their homes. Those who are now living in the sports hall or hotels have been supplied with good food, basic conveniences, and medical services. Food for children is being prepared with particular care.

The next morning, immediately after an operational meeting, the staff dispersed to all four corners of the rayon. After traveling around 15 km from Khobi we stopped our vehicle by a huge pool. We transferred to the "Ural" all-terrain vehicle and..."sailed" on. A dreadful picture unfolded before our eyes. The houses were flooded on the ground floor, cars flattened against the walls had been turned over, and dead animals lay on the sand banks — there were cows, calves, and lots of pigs. Drowned chickens hung from bushes....It is true that some animals had been saved, those that were near the surviving dam or the railroad. Dogs stood shaking on balconies. The surviving livestock wandered along the road not responding to the vehicle's horn, shouts, or sticks.

Photographs had to be taken from the moving bus and occasionally there was not time to write down the names of those people photographed. Anyway, why bother? After all, they are now in the same situation, they all share the same misfortune. Unfortunately there were casualties. Four people died.

...Even those people who pinned their hopes on the security of their homes had to be lifted from the roof by helicopter at night. The crew of Zaynal Lazarevich Ikayev's Mi-8 from the Kutaisi air detachment worked in a strong gusty wind. The helicopter was thrown about, its blades sometimes caught the branches of the trees. And in that very difficult situation Aeroflot's pilots rescued 37 people! One armored personnel carrier driver told me that they had managed to ship more than 200 people out. Vehicle service worker Badri Magrelishvili dived into the water to rescue children and sick people. Bus drivers traveled hundreds of kilometers around their little rayon bringing out stranded cows....

The staff is not letting people return home yet: The threat of a new flood still exists, because there is no protection against the Rioni River — the dam has been washed away by the frenzied river. The flooded lowlands were once drained and protected by a high dam. Settlers from Imeretiya are living in these places with their fertile soil. A street in one settlement has even been named Imeretinskaya Street. And the homes built there are usually single-storied: they suffered worst of all. They were destroyed and property was lost. The fields, cultivated for years using special techniques, were also badly affected. The turbulent waters swept away the fertile layer of the soil....

Yes, tremendous damage has been inflicted on the economy but the most important thing is that the people have been saved.

ECONOMIST EXPLAINS DRAFT LAW ON ENTERPRISES

LD072309 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Text] Draft legislation on a socialist enterprise has been released in the Soviet Union for a nationwide discussion. It lays down the foundations of economic independence of industrial facilities and associations. With due account for remarks, amendments and suggestions to be made during the public discussion, the bill will be submitted to a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, our national legislature. We have asked for comments about the main stipulations of the bill the director of the Institute of the Economy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Leonid Abalkin, who has taken a direct part in drafting the bill.

Our first question was: What new things of principle are contained in the bill?

[Begin recording] [Abalkin, in Russian with superimposed English translation] To begin with, the place of an enterprise and of a labor staff is clearly defined in our ecnomic system. The bill fixes down a stipulation that a labor staff fully disposes of all the government funds it has been granted as a full-fledged master, which naturally implies all the corresponding rights and responsibilies. It is underlined that a labor staff precisely, not the management, acts as the main carrier of all the interests, objectives and functions of an enterprise. A labor staff is not simply drawn into running an enterprise but really controls it. It's exactly the labor staff that endorses the plan for economic and social development and takes decisions on all the major economic matters, including election of executives at all levels from a team leader to the general director of an association of industrial facilities. The decisions of the labor staff involved are final and no one can cancel them.

[Question] What are the economic rights of enterprises under the new bill?

[Abalkin] Enterprises decide independently what their production programs should be on the basis of three types of activity. First, they get orders from the state, and it can order very important products. Secondly, they develop direct links with consumers, and thirdly, they have an outlet through the wholesale trade. An enterprise will be contributing to the national budget an exactly fixed percentage of its profits and dispose of the rest of the profits independently, that is at the discretion of the labor staff, in order to expand production, modernize it, raise wages and salaries and develop the social sphere.

[Question] One article of the bill provides for closing down an enterprise if it fails to work at a profit, in what cases is such a shutdown possible?

[Abalkin] An enterprise can be dismantled in two cases under the bill: first, when there is no need any longer for its products; and secondly, when an enterprise has been working at a loss for a long time, and no measures can make it work at a profit.

[Question] And what's the lot of the workers in such cases?

[Abalkin] Taking into account our principles, full employment for the entire population is ensured on a national scale. When nonprofitable enterprises are eliminated their workers are given time in advance to retrain. [paragraph continues]

Through the entire period of the retraining, the workers draw their average wages. The bill provides for cash grants, too, for a period the worker finds a new job. [as heard] Many industrial and office workers can get jobs at profitable enterprises, where they will be used in second and third work shifts. Besides that, the workers are to be expanded greatly, and so millions of workers will be needed. [end recording]

In general, one can say boldly that there won't be any threat of unemployment for the Soviet people in the foreseeable future. There may be problems with retraining and psychological readjustment, but I repeat: There won't be unemployment, said the Soviet economist Leonid Abalkin.

The draft legislation on a socialist enterprise will yet be discussed by the public and by the members of our supreme legislative assembly, but even now it can be regarded as a major move to further democratize soviet society in its main sphere, that of production.

Interviewed on Acceleration

AU291616 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 27 Jan 87 p 6

[Interview with Leonid Abalkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of its Institute of Economics, by Aleksandr Korotkov: "How To Achieve Acceleration?" -- date and place of interview not specified; opening paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Text] The general orientation toward accelerating the social and economic development of the Soviet Union that was set out by the 27th CPSU Congress is clear. The details of the tactics, methods, and forms of its implementation, however, are still being specified and finetuned. In an interview given to correspondent Aleksandr Korotkov, Leonid Abalkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of its Institute of Economics, spoke about the difficulties and conflicts that have surfaced on this path. (The Politizdat publishing house will soon publish Abalkin's new book "Strategy of Acceleration").

[Korotkov] Many difficulties and social and economic problems with which we are faced today date back a long time. Had we paid attention to them earlier, we would not have to talk about them today. Why were they not dealt with before?

[Abalkin] Not everything should be blamed on subjective factors. The matter is more complicated than that. Today's problems are usually the reverse side of our successes, which have not been insignificant.

In the last 25 years, productivity of social labor increased 3.2 fold and labor productivity in Soviet industry increased 4 fold. Worldwide experience suggests that when real per-capita income doubles, there is a transition to a qualitatively new structure of consumption and a qualitatively new standard of living. This is what happens in the event of doubling. Our real earnings, however, have increased 2.5 fold since 1960. But these very important changes have not sufficed to remove many of our shortcomings, though their nature, too, has changed. For example, despite an overall surplus of machine tools, we do not have enough modern metal-cutting equipment. The Soviet pool of metal-working machinery is larger than that of the United States, Japan, and the FRG altogether. But very often there are no people to operate these machines.

[Korotkov] If this is so, why do we need so many machine tools?

[Abalkin] The answer to this question is part of a more general problem that is connected with changing the stereotypical patterns of economic thinking.

For long years, our country lived under the conditions of war and its negative repercussions, under the conditions of permanent shortages and backwardness. Our entire system was focused on quantitative growth as expressed in gross (volume) indicators.

However, in the meantime, the economic situation underwent radical changes. Quantity ceased to be a necessary synonym for that which is correct. In defiance of this, the economy continued to develop predominantly on an extensive basis. It was concerned with integrating ever new resources into the production process. As a result, there was a sharp drop in the labor productivity growth rates.

The attempts to set this right by means of new construction only aggravated the problems of balance. The national economy of the Soviet Union with its enormous resources was suddenly faced with their shortage. A discrepancy arose between society's needs and the attained level of production, between purchasing power and demand on the one hand and the material provisions on the other.

At the end of the seventies and the start of the eighties, the country's rate of economic development plunged to the lowest level in the history of the Soviet Union.

As was stressed in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee at the 27th CPSU Congress, the main reason for this development was the failure to politically analyze in due course the changed economic situation, to realize the urgency and unpostponability of switching the economy onto intensive methods of development, and to actively apply the results of scientific-technical progress in the national economy. These matters were spoken of, and not little, but no headway was made in the practical implementation.

[Korotkov] What guarantees are there that the whole issue will now get moving? How strong and how effective are the current instruments of intensification?

[Abalkin] The crucial instrument of intensification is the acceleration of scientific-technical progress, the transition toward fundamentally new systems of machinery and new technological processes. To be able to make this transition, it is necessary to ensure the priority development of the engineering complex. And within the engineering complex itself, priority must be given to those branches that determine its own progress: to the production of machine tools and apparatus technology, to electronics and electrical engineering.

That is why the first safeguard of the feasibility of our plans is the restructuring of the national economy, a redistribution of resources.

The volume of investments set aside for the development of engineering will increase 80 percent in the current 5-year plan, which is a major change.

However, it is important not only to provide resources, but also to provide strong incentives for industry to produce what is needed.

In this connection we are introducing, and have already introduced within the framework of the large-scale economic experiment, a system of differentiated incentives based on the indicators of efficiency of new technology.

[Korotkov] What does it mean in practical terms?

[Abalkin] Until recently there were three quality grades: the highest (corresponding to the world standard), first (which was in demand in the Soviet Union), and second (below the standard of society's need). Only two grades have been left. A markup averaging 15 percent of the wholesale price is granted for products of the highest quality, while products of the first grade are subject to a 15 percent markdown. Markups for the highest quality grade existed even before, but the first grade used to get the basic price. That means that producers could enjoy a comfortable life by turning out the first quality grade. This situation has now changed. They either achieve a higher quality, or they will be penalized. The financial difference of 30 percent is really palpable.

Last year 50 percent of all industrial enterprises of the country operated under the conditions of the experiment, comprising all basic engineering branches. As of this year, the entire Soviet industry is making the transition to the new conditions.

[Korotkov] Is there no danger of sluggish, loss-making enterprises being closed down one after another? Will this not generate unemployment?

[Abalkin] We are not threatened by unemployment. We have the reverse problem, a shortage of manpower, and will continue to have it in the foreseeable future. Despite what is, basically, a single-shift operation of equipment, there are some 700,000 unmanned workplaces in our industry alone. If we raised the shift rate to 1.7, the number of unmanned workplaces would reach 4 million.

Once obsolescent machinery is discarded and replaced by a more modern and productive equipment, this number will be considerably reduced. However, the need for manpower will persist. Even greater demands for manpower are in the social and cultural areas and in services, which will be developing at an accelerating pace. These areas are characterized by a remarkable peculiarity: In the material area, technological progress is accompanied by staff reductions; in the nonproduction area the opposite tends to be the case.

For example, the equipment of a medical care institution with sophisticated modern technology has a tremendous social impact. But you need technicians and maintenance workers to be able to operate this technology.... Or, for example, you improve the quality of school instruction by reducing the number of students per class. When their number drops from 40-45 to 30-35, you need more teachers.

[Korotkov] I repeat the question: Will weak enterprises be closed down? What will happen, let us say, to former shoemakers? Will they become teachers? Or technicians operating medical electronic instruments?

[Abalkin] Well, let us be specific. Let us take the example of an enterprise of the light industry that produces shoddy goods. The easiest thing will be to accuse the enterprise management. It does indeed happen quite often that the director does not measure up to the required standards. However, there are also errors in planning and in technical policy that have nothing to do with him.

For a number of reasons, we do not have sufficiently advanced engineering for equipping enterprises of the light industry.

It is clear that we will not improve the situation without a radical solution of this problem. [paragraph continues]

Let us say that we have closed down a shoe factory.... Who will be producing shoes? The best enterprises? But where do we get them from, given the absence of the technological base? That means that the question once again runs up against the central issue -- the technical modernization of the national economy.

This task cannot be resolved overnight. You need a clear perspective, a clear program of action -- operative measures planned for 1 year and medium-term measures for 3 years that must do away with the glaring manifestations of lack of coordination. And, finally, you need strategic measures for 5 years and more.

And in this time the producers of shoes about whom we have spoken will have undergone retraining courses and will assume their places at new machines in their own footwear industry. Today's students will become teachers and technicians operating electronic instruments. The need to change one's workplace will apply primarily to unskilled workers, for whom this transition will not be painful at all.

[Korotkov] But restructuring will affect the interests of very many people. For some of them what is happening today will mean a change for the worse. What do the opponents of the current changes say? What is the gist of their objections to restructuring?

[Abalkin] To a considerable extent, discussions were triggered by the clash between traditional ideas, which reserve a secondary role for economic instruments, and modern views, which regard economic instruments as the actual content of planned management.

If the whole problem was limited to some group of managers who have grown accustomed to talking and are incompetent, the solution would be simple -- to replace these people by managers whose words do not part ways with their deeds.

However, the whole matter is far more complicated. The inertia of thinking has percolated deep into the broadest sections of the population, from workers up to the highest links of management. This inertia is endemic even to people who are dedicated to the cause, who work with full commitment, often to exhaustion, and who are willing to do everything as long as the whole country will profit from it. The whole problem is that the very meaning of the word good is completely different today from its meaning 10 or 20 years ago. The situation has changed down to the foundations. But we have already discussed this.

The second aspect of the dispute has something to do with the fact that an attempt is being made to work out a universal method, to generate universal instruments that would be applicable to all cases of practical life. There are, for example, advocates of such an independence of enterprise, in which their production programs would be drafted on the basis of consumers' demands. However, you cannot seriously consider having the same economic instruments for, for instance, an industrial association manufacturing gigantic turbines, motor vessels, and diesel locomotives and for a small factory for ready to wear clothes. Although the principle is common to them, when we speak about the actual mechanism, general considerations will get us nowhere. Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, spoke about this at the 27th CPSU Congress: If we do not want to repeat past mistakes, we must from the beginning take the path of a differentiated approach, the path of determining a specific mechanism for each branch.

In the case of the clothing factory, it is possible to forgo any centralized delienation of tasks in production, range of products, volume, quality, and style and design. [paragraph continues]

The planning principle finds its expression in the very fact that an enterprise of the clothing industry has been built. That done, it is then possible to delineate the range of its products in its entirety on the basis of consumers' demands and to make flexible prices the instrument of changes in this range.

On the other hand, such an approach is unthinkable in the shipbuilding industry. It is not even necessary because the fashion for motors ships or ice breakers does not change every year. Here it is necessary to have stable, long-term tasks of the plan.

But when these differences are not taken into account, when the dispute is carried into the abstract sphere (about economic instruments in general), conflicts arise: One person has this in mind, and the other one something else.

Finally, the third area of dispute is connected with different notions of what constitutes a reasonable degree of centralization and independence in the work of enterprises.

[Korotkov] The expansion of enterprises' independence is apparently resented by some of those, to whom these enterprises are subordinated.

[Abalkin] You should not think that the entire staff of central management agencies is in favor of preserving bureaucratic methods of management and all plant directors advocate independence. The exact opposite is often true. Some of those who clamored for independence and then got it in the form of the economic experiment only a year later begged that everything should be left as it had been: Do, please, plan for us, preferably in writing, what to produce and whom to supply.

The fact is that every expansion of independence is connected with a higher degree of responsibility. That is inevitable. You have the right of choice. You can phase out a given production line, or you can keep producing it...All the decisions are up to you and it is you who will bear the consequences if you err. It is precisely responsibility that has been a disincentive for some management staff.

Disputes mostly arise when the problem of responsibility falls into oblivion. Some people are issuing warnings: Do we not talk too much about rights, is the independence not too big? To which ends will it lead? However, these people forget that this is the only realistic way of inculcating in people cost-consciousness, a sense of responsibility, and a feeling of being the masters in their own country.

Many people assumed for a long time that with the onset of the social ownership of production assets virtually everyone would immediately act as their master -- thoughtfully, thriftily, and reasonably. Experience has shown this not to be true.

But the problem is not so much that we need time to overcome practices inherited from a past. What we need is that the multiplication of social wealth be reflected as directly and immediately as possible in the position of those who have ensured this multiplication and that, conversely, damage inflicted on society be equally inexorably projected into the standing of those responsible for this damage.

If this is not the case, the unity of interests is upset. What follows is apathy and social passivity. This is not only a "vestige" or proof of poor educational work. The underlying causes lie at a greater depth, in the imperfect relations that make up the mechanism of the movement and realization of social ownership.

It is precisely these relations that we must substantially improve.

KAZAKH CPCC FOOD SUPPLY PANEL MEETS

PM041551 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Strict Accounting and Monitoring of Food Supplies," under the rubric "At the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] A scheduled session of the working group set up under the Central Committee for the rapid solution of the tasks of improving food supplies to the republic's population, chaired by G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, was held 24 January. The question of increasing the production of meat and milk products was discussed.

The session heard reports by F.A. Novikov, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, N.D. Tantsyura, Kazakh SSR trade minister, B.V. Isayev, chairman of the republic Committee for People's Control, and I.N. Nechayev, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Eastern Department of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences.

It was stressed that the agro-industrial complex has many reserves that would make it possible to sharply raise the production level of meat and milk products, although these reserves are being made extremely poor use of at present. For example, the state of affairs with the reproduction of the meat herd is unsatisfactory. Via this reserve along the republic could produce more than 30,000 metric tons of extra meat per year. Another real possibility is to increase the average delivery weight of livestock. Calculations show that if the livestock delivery weight were to be brought up to the set norm, meat "rations" would be quite substantial -- 63,000 metric tons. But even this is not an exhaustive list of all our reserves. Take the problem of livestock murrain, for example. Reducing the incidence of murrain by even 30 percent would make it possible to increase the meat balance by 34,000 metric tons. Closing all channels for the squandering and theft of meat would provide an additional 2,000 metric tons.

A simple arithmetical calculation makes it possible to draw the conclusion that if a responsible, careful attitude is adopted, the republic can and must produce no less than an additional 129,000-130,000 metric tons of meat per year.

Let us turn to the production of milk products. The main aim here is to achieve high, stable milk yield indicators. And this problem is linked directly to the problem of strengthening the feed base. At present, livestock farms are supplied with only 71 percent of their concentrated feed requirements and 69 percent of their protein requirements, which holds back productivity growth considerably. Many milkmaids and team leaders are unaware of the elementary norms of feed consumption and the planned milk yield figures. Only 640 of the republic's 1,600 dairy farms have introduced the flow-line/shop system for milk production.

The fight against livestock diseases is being conducted unsystematically and, at times, with criminal negligence. Last year, for example, as a result of a mass outbreak of brucellosis and tuberculosis among cattle, there was a shortfall of almost 37,000 metric tons of milk, 7,500 metric tons of meat, and more than 16,000 calves. All in all, the economic loss amounted to approximately R31 million.

In this connection, the attitude of some economic workers who count on rehabilitating the herd simply by bringing in stock from other regions of the country does not stand up to criticism.

First, this causes the republic tangible losses and reduces the possibility of satisfying the population's meat product requirements. Second, the policy of bringing in livestock from other regions does not have the intended effect because these animals soon become infected and the problem of replacing them arises all over again.

At the same time, the system developed by the republic's scientists for rearing healthy calves in an infected herd is being poorly introduced. The reason for this is the parasitical attitude of some leaders who find it easier to obtain healthy stock from outside then to organize matters properly on their own farms.

Considerable reserves are concentrated in the processing sectors, and at meat-processing combines in particular. A great deal of waste is caused, for example, by the fact that many meat-processing combines fail to observe the rules for accepting and maintaining cattle. A particularly unsatisfactory situation has taken shape at the Shchuchinsk meat-processing combine in Kokchetav Oblast, where livestock are kept in unsuitable conditions for 40-70 hours, during which time their weight falls sharply.

It is often the case that valuable biological raw materials -- blood, bones, and so forth -- are irretrievably lost. There are even occasions when real delicacies are sent to fur farms. For example, the Arkalyak meat-processing combine supplied as animal feed 15.4 percent tons of tongue, 333 metric tons of pigs heads, and 1.5 metric tons of horse offal.

Poor use is made of high-productivity equipment. At the Kokchetav meat-processing association an edible fat production line and a bone-grinding machine are inoperative, while at the East Kazakhstan meat-processing association an intestine-processing line stands idle and the equipment for the production of fats, meat dumplings, cutlets, and other convenience foods is only 15-percent utilized. Despite the fact that many meat-processing combines in the republic are equipped with obsolete mechanisms and housed in unsuitable premises, the means allocated for reconstruction are systematically unused.

Output quality leaves much to be desired. According to figures provided by the people's control, none of the 29 enterprises in this sector has managed to avoid wastage over the year, and in the meat-processing sphere it has increased from 7 to 12.4 percent. The situation is worst of all at the Kokchetav, Uralsk, Tselinograd, Dzhambul, and Semipalatinsk meat-processing combines, where it is often the case that 20-100 percent of their total product is seen to be below standard and defective.

The number of "pilferers" is showing no signs of falling. Approximately 5,000 people have been involved in the embezzlement of meat products -- this is actually one in seven workers in the republic's meat-processing combines. The total damage amounted to R50,000. Major losses have been brought to light at the Aktyubinsk and Arkalyk meat-processing combines -- R276,000 and $300,000 respectively.

Despite the vast scale of the embezzlement, the departmental control services have not even been carried out at half of the sector's enterprises.

Eliminating all these shortcomings is the prime concern of party, soviet, and economic organs. It is important to achieve the situation whereby one-third of the planned quantities of meat and milk would be sold in the first quarter of this year.

It is essential to begin extensive explanatory work in the near future with the aim of involving the working people in socialist competition to overfulfill projected meat production plans by 1 percent. This will give an additional 12,000 metric tons of valuable food products. This specific task is perfectly feasible, and we must ensure that it is resolved.

KOLBIN CHAIRS MEETING ON FOOD SUPPLIES

LD020953 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 31 Jan 87

[Text] A regular meeting of the working group attached to the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee to urgently solve tasks relating to the improvement of food supplies to the population of the republic was held today, chaired by Comrade Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee. Measures to secure the necessary amount of storage areas for potatoes and fruit and vegetable produce from the 1987 harvest were discussed. It was noted that there is an acute shortage of storage areas, especially for vegetables. Compared with a storage norm of 422,000 tonnes, the existing areas are capable of accommodating only about 190,000 tonnes, which makes up no more than 45 percent of the vegetable produce needed by city dwellers.

In the light of the demands of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and of the pressing nature of the tasks relating to food supplies to the population, the attention of the leaders of the State Agro-Industrial Committee was drawn to the impermissibility of work lacking in initiative in the conditions of restructuring. It was proposed that within the shortest period of time they resolve the noted shortcomings, raise their sense of responsibility for the work entrusted to them, and bring to an end indifferent attitudes to do anything concerning the satisfaction of peoples' most urgent needs.

CSA REPORTS ON EQUIPMENT PREPARATION FOR SPRING

LD062215 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] The country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes are completing the preparation of technical equipment for spring field operations. As statistical data show, more mechanisms for introducing intensive industiral technologies of crop cultivation have been received. The USSR Central Statistical Administration reported today that by 1 February more sowing and tilling equipment has been repaired than by this time last year. Most farms completed this work by the start of the year.

In a number of southern regions, however, where mass operations are to take place in the immediate future, technical equipment has been poorly prepared. This has been noted in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. The completion of repair work has been hampered on a number of farms by shortage of spares. Their deliveries are still being wrecked by the Noginsk Fuel Equipment Works, the Vladimir and Altay Tractor Works, the Odessa Soil Cultivation Equipment Association and other enterprises.

The degree of preparation of heavy-duty tractors, which bear the main load on farms during sowing, remains inadmissibly low. Measures are being taken now on kolkhozes and sovkhozes to increase the tractors' capacity during shifts. In a number of republics it constitutes no more than 70-80 percent of the norm. For this purpose, training of machine operators is being conducted, and the system itself of organizing their work is being revised.

CONTINUED COVERAGE OF SOYUZ TM-2 FLIGHT

Official Interviewed

LD062001 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] The first 24 hours spent by Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin aboard the spacecraft Soyuz TM-2 are drawing to a close. Our correspondent Leonid Lazarevich reports.

[Lazarevich] At this moment, the craft is completing its 13th circuit around the earth. In less than 24 hours, dawns and sunsets followed each other 12 times, as the craft makes a circuit around the earth in 90 minutes. As you remember, the launch took place in the middle of the night. The crew worked after the launch and went to sleep in the morning. They are now starting a new working day. A big screen in the flight control center shows a list of operations completed by the crew, and each entry ends with words no faults. The flight of the Mir station continues according to the planned program. All the systems of the craft Soyuz TM-2 are operating normally. I would like to remind you that it is for the first time that such a spacecraft carries out a flight in a piloted regime. Before a communication session, I interviewed Viktor Dmitriyevich Blagov, deputy flight supervisor.

[Begin recording] [Lazarevich] Soyuz spacecrafts have been operational for 20 years; now one letter has been added to the name of a piloted craft: Soyuz TM. How different is this space craft from its predecessors?

[Blagov] This is the third series of Soyuz crafts. You remember, the first series was called just Soyuz; the second, Soyuz T, the T standing for transport; and the third, we could agree to call it the third series, the third series is Soyuz TM, which means soyuz transport, modified [transportnyy, modifitsirovannyy] The approach system has been considerably modified. The needle [igla] -- the system of measuring parameters of relative movement of two objects during approach -- has become obsolete and has been replaced with a modern system, Kurs. It is manufactured on the basis of new elements, it is more reliable, and, the most important thing, it does not require the reciprocal orientation of the station to the Soyuz during approach. As we estimate that in the near future the station will be interfaced [sostykovana] with scientific modules, its mass will grow considerably, and, it is clear that the station's ability for maneuvering will lose in effectiveness. Equipped with such a system for measuring the relative parameters of movement, the Soyuz may approach a nonorientated station. It will be capable of choosing for itself the port it has to approach...

[Lazarevich, interrupting]...one of the two.

[Blagov] Yes, one of the two, and, if necessary, it will fly around; there will be no need for the station to carry out any manipulations in the aspect of orientation. This will save fuel significantly at the station; this fuel can be further used for carrying out scientific research.

[Lazarevich] And the last question. When will the craft and station meet?

[Blagov] The craft - station docking has been scheduled for 8 February.

[Lazarevich] As the launch, this will take place at night. [end recording]

Cosmonauts Test Equipment

LD070734 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Text] Cosmonauts Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin are completing their second working day in near-earth orbit. The cosmonauts have tested the equipment of the new spaceship and the units, including the rendezvous and docking systems, and the operation of the propulsion system in various modes. Several corrections were made to the Soyuz TM-2 flight orbit. They were carried out in order to bring the orbits of the transport spacecraft and the Mir station closer together. Docking is planned for 8 February.

Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin are feeling well.

Docking Preparations

LD070926 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0845 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 7 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent reports from the flight control center:

The Soyuz TM-2 spacecraft, piloted by Uyriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin, completed 23 revolutions round the earth by 1100 Moscow time [0800 GMT].

The crew fulfilled routine operations, checking the spacecraft's onboard systems and the air-tightness of the compartments.

Maneuvers for rendezvousing with the Mir - Progress-27 orbital complex have been carried out.

After corrections, the parameters of Soyuz TM-2's orbit are:

-- Maximum distance from the Earth's surface: 308 km;
-- minimum distance from the earth's surface: 269 km;
-- period of revolution 90.1 minutes;
-- inclination: 51.6 degrees.

In accordance with the planned program, testing of the transport ship Soyuz TM-2 will continue today, as will preparations for the docking with the Mir station.

According to telemetric data and crew reports, the flight is proceeding normally. Cosmonauts Romanenko and Laveykin are feeling well.

Docking Scheduled 7 Feb

LD071249 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Excerpt] For the first time the cosmonauts are riding a spacecraft of a new series, "Soyuz TM". Its pilotless model was tested in May 1986 and showed an excellent performance.

The spacecraft is fitted out with the "Kurs" system of measuring parametres of relative rapprochement which ensures a reliable automatic docking of the craft with the orbital station. It is to take place on the night from February 7 to February 8. The craft will be moving towards the "Mir" station for two days instead of one, as was the case before. This rapprochement schedule permits to save fuel for decisive manoeuvering during the link-up.

The "Mir" station of the new, third generation has six docking units which are the basic block of the future research laboratory. A specialized space astrophysical observatory will be docked with "Mir". It is one of the modules that the "Mir" can receive. First they will be docked with the docking berth in the end face of the station and later will be transferred to one of the four lateral docking berths of "Mir." During the operation the crew will be in a working compartment of the craft.

The flight program is rather extensive. It includes the unloading of the "Progress" transport spacecraft, the completion of the equipping of the station, the testing of new instruments and the putting into service of the astrophysical module.

The on-board equipment of the space observatory includes four x-ray telescopes created by scientists from the USSR, West Germany and Holland with the participation of British specialists. Before starting their work with them, the crew will ensure the accurate orientation of the complex towards the objects to be studied.

Later, in summer, a Soviet-Syrian crew will visit the station.

Soyuz TM-2 Docks

LD072346 Moscow TASS in English 2343 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS -- The Soyuz TM-2 spaceship piloted by Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin today docked with the orbital complex -Mir-Progress-27 at 2 hours 28 minutes Moscow time.

Both cosmonauts are in good health.

SCIENTISTS TO TEST SOIL FROM MARS BY YEAR 2000

NC060922 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 31 Jan 87

[Text] Soviet scientists intend to bring soil samples from Mars to Earth by the year 2000. This has been stated in the new program for the exploration of Mars announced by Roald Sagdeyev, the official in charge of this program, at a scientific conference in Moscow. Some of the experiments, such as landing robots on Mars, launching floating balloons into Mars' atmosphere, and searching for signs of organic life, will be the first ones of their kind.